compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Brussels ACO.

Note 4: Alternative methods of compliance approved in accordance with AD 87–07–01 (superseded by this action) are not considered approved as alternative methods of compliance with this AD.

(g) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the document referred to herein upon request to Jetstream Aircraft Limited, Manager Product Support, Prestwick Airport, Ayrshire, KA9 2RW Scotland; or Jetstream Aircraft Inc., Librarian, P.O. Box 16029, Dulles International Airport, Washington, DC; or may examine this document at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

(h) This amendment supersedes AD 87–07–01, Amendment 39–5582.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 14, 1996.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–6881 Filed 3–21–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–199–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 Series Airplanes and KC–10A (Military) 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 McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 series airplanes, and KC–10A (military) airplanes. This proposal would require high frequency eddy current inspection(s) to detect cracks in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer, and various follow-on actions, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by reports of crack development in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer due to fatigue. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer and, subsequently, lead to reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 17, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–199–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 McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1–L51 (2–60). This information may be examined 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Atmur, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5224; fax (310) 627–5210.

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–199–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–199–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The FAA has received reports of crack development in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer on several McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 series airplanes. These airplanes had accumulated between 37,738 and 57,029 total flight hours and between 13,831 and 32,313 total flight cycles. The cause of such cracking has been attributed to fatigue. Fatigue cracking in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could result in reduced structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer; this situation subsequently could lead to reduced controllability of the airplane.

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas DC–10 Service Bulletin 53–167, Revision 1, dated February 15, 1995, which describes procedures for high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection(s) to detect cracks in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer. For cases where no cracks are detected during inspection, the service bulletin describes procedures for either conducting repetitive inspections, or installing a preventative modification. The preventative modification entails cold working holes in angles and installing angles on pivot supports. For cases where any crack is detected during inspection, the service bulletin describes procedures for either repairing the cracked area (temporary repair) and follow-on actions, or replacing the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer with a new secondary pivot support (permanent repair). Replacement of the affected secondary pivot support will ensure the structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer, and will eliminate the need for repetitive inspections.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require HFEC inspection(s) to detect cracks in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer. The proposed AD would also require repair of the cracked area and follow-on actions, or replacement of the cracked secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer with a new secondary pivot support. Such replacement would constitute

terminating action for the repetitive inspections. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

There are approximately 376 McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 series airplanes and KC–10A (military) airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 230 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 5 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 cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $69,000, or $300 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.

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 USC 106(g) 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 95–NM–199–AD.

Applicability: Model DC–10–10, -15, -30, and -40 series airplanes, and KC–10A (military) airplanes; as listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–10 Service Bulletin 53–167, Revision 1, dated February 15, 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 otherwise 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 (d) 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 fatigue cracking in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer and, subsequently, lead to reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 10,000 total landings, or within 3,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection to detect cracks in the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–10 Service Bulletin 53–167, Revision 1, dated February 15, 1995.

(b) If no cracks are detected during the HFEC inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, accomplish paragraph (b)(1) of this AD until paragraph (b)(2) of this AD is accomplished.

(1) Repeat the HFEC inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 10,000 landings.

(2) Accomplishment of the preventative modification in accordance with Condition I (no cracks), Option 2, of the service bulletin constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraph (b)(1) of this AD.

(c) If any crack is detected during the HFEC inspection required by paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish either paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD.

(1) Repair the crack in accordance with Paragraph (1) of Condition II (cracks), Option 1 (temporary repair), of the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin. Within 300 landings after accomplishing that repair, perform a visual inspection to detect cracks at the area of the repair, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If any crack is detected during the visual inspection required by paragraph (c)(1) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(ii) Prior to 2,800 landings after accomplishing the HFEC inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, replace the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer with a new secondary pivot support, in accordance with Condition II (cracks), Option 2, of the service bulletin. Accomplishment of this replacement constitutes terminating action for the repetitive HFEC and visual inspection requirements of this AD.

(2) Replace the secondary pivot support of the horizontal stabilizer with a new secondary pivot support, in accordance with Condition II (cracks), Option 2 (permanent repair), of the service bulletin. Accomplishment of this replacement constitutes terminating action for the repetitive HFEC and visual inspection requirements of this AD.

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

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(e) 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 March 18, 1996.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–6931 Filed 3–21–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–ANE–55]

Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Inc. TFE731 Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness