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 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) 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 has been placed 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 adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

Alexander Schleicher Segelflugzeugbau: Docket No. 98–CE–05–AD.

Applicability: Model ASW–19 sailplanes, serial numbers 19001 through 19405, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each sailplane 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 sailplanes 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 (e) 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 within the next 90 days after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

To prevent premature release of the tow cable during take-off, which could result in loss of the sailplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Inspect the tow release cable guide fittings for front or rear mount on the bulkhead of the sailplane in accordance with the Actions section in Alexander Schleicher Technical Note (TN) No. 18, dated July 3, 1984.

Note 2: It is recommended that the maintenance manual pages called out in the INSTRUCTIONS section of Alexander Schleicher TN No. 18 be exchanged with the current pages in the maintenance manual.

(b) If the cable guide fitting is mounted on the front of the bulkhead, prior to further flight, remove the fitting and remount the cable guide fitting on the rear of the bulkhead in accordance with the Actions section in Alexander Schleicher TN No. 18, dated July 3, 1984.

(c) After remounting the cable fitting, prior to further flight, check the neutral travel of the cable and adjust if necessary, in accordance with the Actions section in Alexander Schleicher TN No. 18, dated July 3, 1984.

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

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Small Airplane Directorate.

(f) Questions or technical information related to Alexander Schleicher Technical Note No. 18, dated July 3, 1984, should be directed to Alexander Schleicher Segelflugzeugbau, 6416 Poppenhausen, Wasserkuppe, Federal Republic of Germany; telephone: 49.6658.890 or 49.6658.8920; facsimile: 49.6658.8923 or 49.6658.8940. This service information may be examined at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in German AD No. 84–115, dated July 16, 1984.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on May 11, 1998.

Marvin R. Nuss,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–13198 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–78–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model 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 certain Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive inspections to detect cracking of the doubler angle and discrepancies of the fasteners that connect the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box, and corrective actions, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct fatigue cracking in the doubler angle and discrepancies of the fasteners that connect the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box. Such cracking and discrepancies could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 18, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–78–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: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

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–78–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–78–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, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during full-scale fatigue testing of the Airbus Model A300 series airplane, cracking was found on the forward doubler angle at the junction with the lower surface of the wing. This cracking originated in the seventh fastener hole, starting from the front, on the face of the doubler angle that is attached to the lower surface of the wing. The DGAC has received reports of cracking in the same location on in-service airplanes, which has been attributed to fatigue caused by the relative movement between the fuselage skin panel and the lower wing skin. Such fatigue cracking, if not corrected, could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A300–53–6110, dated April 8, 1997, which describes procedures for performing repetitive detailed visual inspections to detect cracking of the doubler angle, and repetitive detailed external visual inspections to detect discrepancies (i.e., damage, stretching, cracking, or distortion) of the fasteners that connect the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box. This service bulletin also describes procedures for replacing discrepant fasteners with new fasteners, and performing follow-on corrective actions. (These follow-on actions include performing a rotating probe inspection of the fastener hole to detect cracking or distortion and repairing the fastener hole, if cracking is detected.)

The DGAC classified Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6110 as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 97–383–240(B), dated December 17, 1997, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

Airbus also has issued Service Bulletin A300–53–6063, dated December 12, 1996, which describes procedures for replacing the existing doubler angle with a longer splice plate and an improved doubler angle. Accomplishment of this replacement would eliminate the need for the repetitive inspections described previously.

FAA's Conclusions

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.

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 require accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin described previously, except as discussed below. This proposed AD also would provide for an optional terminating action for the repetitive inspections.

Operators should note that, in consonance with the findings of the DGAC, the FAA has determined that the repetitive inspections proposed by this AD can be allowed to continue in lieu of accomplishment of a terminating action. In making this determination, the FAA considers that, in this case, long-term continued operational safety will be adequately assured by accomplishing the repetitive inspections to correct cracking before it represents a hazard to the airplane.

Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin

Operators should note that, unlike the procedures described in Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6110, this proposed AD would not permit further flight if any crack is found in the doubler angle, or if any discrepancy is found in the fastener holes or the fasteners that connect the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box. The FAA has determined that, because of the safety implications and consequences associated with such cracking or discrepancies, any subject doubler angle that is found to be cracked or any fastener that is found to be discrepant must be replaced prior to further flight.

Operators also should note that, although Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6110 specifies that the manufacturer may be contacted for disposition of certain repair conditions, this proposal would require the repair of those conditions to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 54 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspections, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the inspections proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $6,480, or $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.

Should an operator elect to accomplish the optional terminating

action specified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6063 that would be provided by this AD action, it would take approximately 109 work hours to accomplish it, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. The cost of required parts would be approximately $4,028 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of that optional terminating action would be $10,568 per airplane.

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 adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 98–NM–78–AD.

Applicability: Model A300–600 series airplanes, on which Airbus Modification 11044 or Airbus Modification 11045 (reference Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6063, dated December 12, 1996) has not been accomplished, 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 (f) 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 fatigue cracking of the doubler angle and discrepancies of the fasteners that connect the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Perform a detailed visual inspection to detect cracking of the doubler angle, and a detailed external visual inspection to detect discrepancies of the fasteners that connect the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box, on the left and right sides of the airplane, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6110, dated April 8, 1997, at the time specified in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this AD, as applicable. Thereafter, repeat the inspections of the doubler angle and fasteners at intervals not to exceed 2,400 flight cycles.

(1) For airplanes on which a detailed visual inspection has been performed within the last 2,400 flight cycles prior to the effective date of this AD, in accordance with Structural Significant Item (SSI) 57–10–19 of the Airbus A300–600 Maintenance Review Board (MRB) Document: Inspect within 2,400 flight cycles after the most recent SSI inspection.

(2) For airplanes on which a detailed visual inspection has not been performed within the last 2,400 flight cycles prior to the effective date of this AD, in accordance with Structural Significant Item (SSI) 57–10–19 of the Airbus A300–600 Maintenance Review Board (MRB) Document: Inspect at the time specified in paragraph (a)(2)(i), (a)(2)(ii), or (a)(2)(iii), as applicable.

(i) For airplanes that have accumulated 6,600 or more total flight cycles as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect within 750 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD.

(ii) For airplanes that have accumulated more than 3,100 total flight cycles, but less than 6,600 total flight cycles as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect within 1,500 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD.

(iii) For airplanes that have accumulated 3,100 total flight cycles or less as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect prior to the accumulation of 4,600 total flight cycles.

(b) If any discrepancy is found in a fastener that connects the doubler angle and the bottom panel of the center wing box during any detailed external visual inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD: Prior to further flight, remove the discrepant fastener, and perform a rotating probe inspection to detect discrepancies of the fastener holes, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6110, dated April 8, 1997.

(1) If no discrepancy is found in any fastener hole, prior to further flight, install a new fastener, in accordance with the service bulletin. Thereafter, repeat the inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD at intervals not to exceed 2,400 flight cycles.

(2) If any discrepancy is found in any fastener hole, prior to further flight, except as provided by paragraph (e) of this AD, repair in accordance with the service bulletin, and accomplish the actions required by paragraph (c) of this AD.

(c) If any crack is found in the doubler angle during any detailed visual inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, modify the doubler angle in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6063, dated December 12, 1996. Accomplishment of the modification constitutes terminating action for both repetitive inspection requirements of this AD.

(d) Accomplishment of the modification in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6063, dated December 12, 1996, constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of this AD.

(e) If any discrepancy of a fastener hole is found during any inspection of a discrepant fastener as required by paragraph (b) of this AD, and the service bulletin specifies to contact Airbus for appropriate action: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, 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, International Branch, ANM–116. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

(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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 97–383–240(B), dated December 17, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 13, 1998.

John J. Hickey,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–13311 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 97–AWA–6]

RIN 2120 AA66

Proposed Modification of the San Diego Class B Airspace Area; CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to modify the San Diego, CA, Class B airspace area. Specifically, this action proposes to lower the upper limit of the San Diego Class B airspace area from 12,500 feet mean sea level (MSL) to 10,000 feet MSL; expand the western and eastern boundaries of the airspace area; and move the southern boundary north to align with the POGGI Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Tactical Air Navigation (VORTAC). The FAA is proposing this action to improve the flow of air traffic, enhance safety, and reduce the potential for midair collision in the San Diego Class B airspace area while accommodating the concerns of airspace users.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 20, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket, AGC–200, Airspace Docket No. 97–AWA–6, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington DC 20591. Comments may also be sent electronically to the following Internet address: nprmcmts@mail.hq.faa.gov. The official docket may be examined in the Rules Docket, Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 916, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Division.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken McElroy, Airspace and Rules Division, ATA–400, Office of Air Traffic Airspace Management, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested 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 should 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. 97–AWA–6.'' 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 both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will also be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM's

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded from the FAA regulations section of the Fedworld electronic bulletin board service (telephone: 703–321–3339) or the Federal Register's electronic bulletin board service (telephone: 202–512–1661), using a modem and suitable communications software.

Internet users may reach the FAA's web page at http://www.faa.gov or the Federal Register's web page at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs for access to recently published rulemaking documents.

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Air Traffic Airspace Management, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–8783. Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should call the FAA's Office of Rulemaking, (202) 267–9677 for a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11–2A, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Distribution System, that describes the application procedure.

Background

On December 17, 1991, the FAA published the Airspace Reclassification Final Rule (56 FR 65655). This rule discontinued the use of the term ''Terminal Control Area'' and replaced it with the designation ''Class B airspace area.'' This change in terminology is reflected in this NPRM.

The Class B airspace area program was developed to reduce the potential for midair collision in the congested airspace surrounding airports with high density air traffic by providing an area wherein all aircraft are subject to certain operating rules and equipment requirements.

The density of traffic and the type of operations being conducted in the airspace surrounding major terminals increases the probability of midair collisions. In 1970, an extensive study found that the majority of midair collisions occurred between a general aviation (GA) aircraft and an air carrier or military aircraft, or another GA aircraft. The basic causal factor common to these conflicts was the mix of aircraft operating under visual flight rules (VFR) and aircraft operating under instrument flight rules (IFR). Class B airspace areas provide a method to accommodate the increasing number of IFR and VFR operations. The regulatory requirements of Class B airspace areas afford the greatest protection for the greatest number of people by giving air traffic control increased capability to provide aircraft separation service, thereby minimizing the mix of controlled and uncontrolled aircraft.

On May 21, 1970, the FAA published the Designation of Federal Airways, Controlled Airspace, and Reporting Points Final Rule (35 FR 7782). This rule provided for the establishment of Class B airspace areas. To date, the FAA has established a total of 29 Class B airspace areas. The FAA is proposing to take action to modify or implement the application of these proven control areas to provide greater protection for air traffic in the airspace areas most commonly used by passenger-carrying aircraft.

The standard configuration of a Class B airspace area contains three