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 leakage of the hydraulically operated valve of the parking brake of the main landing gear, which could result in failure of the ''blue'' hydraulic system and consequent failure of alternate parking brake and emergency braking systems, accomplish the following:

Inspections/Follow-On Actions

(a) Within 7 days after the effective date of this AD: Do a one-time detailed visual inspection to determine the part number (P/N) and serial number (S/N) of the hydraulically operated valve of the parking brake of the main landing gear per Airbus Service Bulletin A330–32A3139 (for Model A330 series airplanes) or A340–32A4176 (for Model A340 series airplanes), both including Appendix 01, both dated September 14, 2001, as applicable.

(1) If no P/N or S/N is identified as affected equipment per the applicable service bulletin, no further action is required by this AD.

(2) If any P/N or S/N is identified as affected equipment per the applicable service bulletin: Before further flight, perform the follow-on actions (which may include a visual inspection for hydraulic fluid leakage at the valve; repair or replacement of the valve with a new or serviceable valve if leakage is found; repetitive inspections if valve is not replaced, or if the valve is replaced with a valve having the same P/N or S/N; and an operational test), according to the applicable service bulletin.

Note 2: For the purposes of this AD, a detailed visual inspection is defined as: ''An intensive visual examination of a specific structural area, system, installation, or assembly to detect damage, failure, or irregularity. Available lighting is normally supplemented with a direct source of good lighting at intensity deemed appropriate by the inspector. Inspection aids such as mirror, magnifying lenses, etc., may be used. Surface cleaning and elaborate access procedures may be required.''

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, International Branch, ANM–116, 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, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(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.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directives 2001–516(B) and 2001–517(B), both dated October 31, 2001.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 26, 2001.

Ali Bahrami,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–32193 Filed 12–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NM–335–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document revises an earlier proposed airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes, that would have required repetitive tests of double-skin feeder tanks for fuel leaks, and corrective actions, if necessary. It also would have required modification of seals in the feeder tanks, which would have terminated the repetitive leak tests. That proposal was prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign airworthiness authority. This new action revises the proposed rule by making the proposed requirements applicable to additional airplanes. The actions specified by this new proposed AD are intended to prevent fuel leaks from the feeder tanks, which could result in fuel vapors in the cabin that could come into contact with ignition sources. The actions are intended to address the identified unsafe condition.

DATES: Comments must be received by February 6, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NM–335–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. Comments may be submitted via fax to (425) 227–1232. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: 9-anm-nprmcomment@faa.gov. Comments sent via fax or the Internet must contain ''Docket No. 2000–NM–335–AD'' in the subject line and need not be submitted in triplicate. Comments sent via the Internet as attached electronic files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Dassault Falcon Jet, P.O. Box 2000, South Hackensack, New Jersey 07606. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Rodriguez, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–1137; 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 action may be changed in light of the comments received.

Submit comments using the following format:

- Organize comments issue-by-issue. For example, discuss a request to change the compliance time and a request to change the service bulletin reference as two separate issues.
- For each issue, state what specific change to the proposed AD is being requested.
- Include justification (e.g., reasons or data) for each request.

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 action must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 2000–NM–335–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. 2000–NM–335–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to add an airworthiness directive (AD) applicable to certain Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes was published as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 2001 (66 FR 38585). That NPRM would have required repetitive tests of double-skin feeder tanks for fuel leaks, and corrective actions, if necessary. It also would have required modification of seals in the feeder tanks, which would have terminated the repetitive leak tests. That NPRM was prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign airworthiness authority. That condition, if not corrected, could result in fuel leaks from the feeder tanks, which could result in fuel vapors in the cabin that could come into contact with ignition sources.

Actions Since Issuance of Previous Proposal

Since the issuance of that NPRM, the FAA has received information that the defect of the seals on double-skin feeder tanks on frames 28, 29, and 31, which was the subject of the NPRM, may exist on additional airplanes. Though the NPRM would have applied to Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes with serial numbers 253 to 286 inclusive, 288, 290, and 291; airplanes with serial numbers 222 to 252 inclusive are also subject to the identified unsafe condition. Therefore, these airplanes also must be made subject to the repetitive tests of double-skin feeder tanks for fuel leaks, corrective actions, if necessary, and modification of seals in the feeder tanks, as proposed in the original NPRM.

Conclusion

Since the change described previously expands the scope of the originally proposed rule, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to reopen the comment period to provide additional opportunity for public comment.

Comments Received in Response to the NPRM

Due consideration has been given to the following comments, which were received in response to the NPRM.

Refer to New Service Information

The commenter, the airplane manufacturer, requests that the FAA revise paragraphs (a) and (b) of the NPRM to refer to certain work cards of the Dassault Falcon 50 Maintenance Manual, Revision 7, dated August 2001. The NPRM refers to Temporary Revision No. 19 to the Dassault Falcon 50 Maintenance Manual, dated April 2000, as the appropriate source of service information for the actions in those paragraphs. The commenter states that it is preferable to refer to the work cards in Revision 7 of the maintenance manual, rather than to Temporary Revision No. 19, because the work cards more clearly identify the relevant material.

We concur that the work cards in Revision 7 of the Dassault Falcon 50 Maintenance Manual, as specified by the commenter, are a more definitive source of service information. We have revised paragraphs (a) and (b) of the supplemental NPRM accordingly.

Clarify Paragraph (c)

The commenter also asks us to revise the wording of paragraph (c) of the NPRM to include the words ''double skin.'' We concur that this change will provide clarification and, accordingly, have revised paragraph (c) of this supplemental NPRM to specify that the action described in that paragraph consists of rework of the seals of the DOUBLE-SKIN feeder tanks at frames 28 and 31.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 46 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed leak tests, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed leak tests on U.S. operators is estimated to be $22,080, or $480 per airplane, per test.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 50 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed reworking of the seals in the feeder tanks, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. The required parts would be provided at no charge to the operator. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the reworking of the seals on U.S. operators is estimated to be $138,000, or $3,000 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are 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 proposed AD were not adopted. The cost impact figures discussed in AD rulemaking actions represent only the time necessary to perform the specific actions actually required by the AD. These figures typically do not include incidental costs, such as the time required to gain access and close up, planning time, or time necessitated by other administrative actions.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have a substantial direct effect 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, it is determined that this proposal would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

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:

Dassault Aviation: Docket 2000–NM–335–AD.

Applicability: Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes, certificated in any category, serial numbers 222 to 286 inclusive, 288, 290, and 291.

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 (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 fuel leaks from the feeder tanks, which could result in fuel vapors in the cabin that could come into contact with ignition sources, accomplish the following:

Leak Testing

(a) Within 7 months after the effective date of this AD: Perform a feeder tank leak test by sampling at the drain ports of frames 29 and 31, in accordance with Work Card No. 686.3/1 of the Dassault Falcon 50 Maintenance Manual, Revision 7, dated August 2001. Repeat the leak test at intervals not to exceed 13 months, until accomplishment of paragraph (c) of this AD.

Corrective Action

(b) If the feeder tank leak test indicates that a leak is present: Prior to further flight, renew the seal, in accordance with Work Card No. 686.4/1 of the Dassault Falcon 50 Maintenance Manual, Revision 7, dated August 2001.

Modification

(c) Within 78 months since the date of manufacture of the airplane: Rework the seals of the double-skin feeder tanks at frames 28 and 31, in accordance with Dassault Service Bulletin F50–328, dated May 31, 2000. Accomplishment of the rework terminates the requirements of this AD.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA. 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 Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 2000–163–030(B), dated April 19, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 26, 2001.

Ali Bahrami,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–32194 Filed 12–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2001–NM–209–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 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 Boeing Model 767 series airplanes. This proposal would require an inspection of the tripod strut assembly of the inboard support of the leading edge slat of the wing for a preload condition, and follow-on actions. For certain airplanes, this proposal also would require inspection and replacement of the existing tripod struts with new, adjustable struts, if necessary. This action is necessary to prevent damage to the tripod strut assembly due to a preload condition, which could result in loss of control of the inboard leading edge slat or separation of the slat from the airplane, and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane. This action is intended to address the identified unsafe condition.

DATES: Comments must be received by February 19, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2001–NM–209–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. Comments may be submitted via fax to (425) 227–1232. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: *9-anm-nprmcomment@faa.gov*. Comments sent via fax or the Internet must contain ''Docket No. 2001–NM–209–AD'' in the subject line and need not be submitted in triplicate. Comments sent via the Internet as attached electronic files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Craycraft, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2782; fax (425) 227–1181.

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 action may be changed in light of the comments received.

Submit comments using the following format:

- Organize comments issue-by-issue. For example, discuss a request to change the compliance time and a request to change the service bulletin reference as two separate issues.
- For each issue, state what specific change to the proposed AD is being requested.