SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all Model DC–9–81 (MD–81), DC–9–82 (MD–82), DC–9–83 (MD–83), DC–9–87 (MD–87) and MD–88 airplanes. This proposed AD would require repetitive inspections for cracking of the left and right upper center skin panels of the horizontal stabilizer, and corrective action if necessary. This proposed AD was prompted by a report of a crack found in the upper skin panel at the aft inboard corner of a right horizontal stabilizer. We are proposing this AD to detect and correct cracks in the horizontal stabilizer upper center skin panel. Uncorrected cracks might ultimately lead to the loss of overall structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by February 7, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments on any of the following methods:

- Hand Delivery: Deliver to Mail Address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- Internet https://www.myboeingfleet.com. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, the FAA, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 16, 2010.

Ali Bahrami,
Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–32207 Filed 12–22–10; 8:45 am]
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FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Roger Durbin, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles ACO, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Blvd, Lakewood, CA 90712–4137; telephone: (562) 627–5233; fax: (562) 627–5210; e-mail: roger.durbin@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under the ADDRESSES section. Include “Docket No. FAA–2010–1203; Directorate Identifier 2010–NM–168–AD” at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

Discussion

We have reviewed Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–55A065. Uncorrected cracking could result in loss of the overall structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer.

Related Service Information

We reviewed Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–55A068, dated July 16, 2010. This service bulletin describes procedures for repetitive eddy current inspections, either (Option 1) two High Frequency Eddy Current (ETHF) scans
and one Low Frequency Eddy Current (ETLF) scan, or (Option 2) three ETHF scans, to detect cracking of the right and left upper center skin panels of the horizontal stabilizer. Corrective actions include replacing any cracked horizontal stabilizer upper center skin panel with a serviceable panel or contacting Boeing for possible temporary repair instructions.

The repetitive interval is 5,200 flight cycles or 2,500 flight cycles depending on the type of eddy current inspection option selected.


**FAA’s Determination**

We are proposing this AD because we evaluated all the relevant information and determined the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop in other products of the same type design.

**Proposed AD Requirements**

This proposed AD would require accomplishing the actions specified in the service information described previously, except as discussed under “Differences Between the Proposed AD and the Service Information.”

**Differences Between the Proposed AD and the Service Information**

Alert Service Bulletin MD80–55A068, dated July 16, 2010, provides an option to contact the manufacturer for instructions on how to repair cracking, but this proposed AD would require replacing the cracked skin panel.

**Costs of Compliance**

We estimate that this proposed AD will affect 668 airplanes of U.S. registry. We estimate the following costs to comply with this proposed AD:

### ESTIMATED COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Labor cost</th>
<th>Parts cost</th>
<th>Cost per product</th>
<th>Cost on U.S. operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection ..........</td>
<td>4 work-hours × $85 per hour = $340 per inspection cycle.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$340 per inspection cycle ..........</td>
<td>$227,120 per inspection cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We estimate the following costs to do any necessary repairs that would be required based on the results of the proposed inspection. We have no way of determining the number of aircraft that might need these repairs.

### ON-CONDITION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Labor cost</th>
<th>Parts cost</th>
<th>Cost per product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Skin panel replacement .........................</td>
<td>648 work-hours × $85 per hour = $55,080 ..........</td>
<td>$36,405</td>
<td>$91,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Skin panel replacement .........................</td>
<td>648 work-hours × $85 per hour = $55,080 ..........</td>
<td>54,071</td>
<td>109,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authority for This Rulemaking**

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA’s authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency’s authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in subtitle VII, part A, subpart III, section 44701: “General requirements.” Under that section, Congress charges the FAA, with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

**Regulatory Findings**

We determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD 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.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify 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),
3. Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and
4. 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.

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39**

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

**The Proposed Amendment**

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA proposes to amend 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):

**Comments Due Date**

(a) We must receive comments by February 7, 2011.

**Affected ADs**

(b) None.

**Applicability**

(c) This AD applies to all McDonnell Douglas Corporation Model DC–9–81 (MD–81), DC–9–82 (MD–82), DC–9–83 (MD–83), DC–9–87 (MD–87) and MD–88 airplanes, certificated in any category.
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Subject
(d) Joint Aircraft System Component (JASCO)/Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 55: Stabilizers.

Unsafe Condition
(e) This AD was prompted by a report of a crack found in the upper center skin panel at the aft inboard corner of a right horizontal stabilizer. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct cracks in the horizontal stabilizer upper center skin panel. Uncorrected cracks might ultimately lead to the loss of overall structural integrity of the horizontal stabilizer.

Compliance
(f) Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

Inspections
(g) Before the accumulation of 20,000 total flight cycles, or within 4,379 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, do eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the left and right upper center skin panels of the horizontal stabilizer, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–55A068, dated July 16, 2010.

(1) If no crack is found during any inspection required by paragraph (g) of this AD, repeat the applicable inspections thereafter at the applicable times specified in paragraph 1.E., “Compliance,” of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–55A068, dated July 16, 2010.

(2) If any crack is found during any inspection required by paragraph (g) of this AD, before further flight, replace the skin panel with a serviceable skin panel, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–55A068, dated July 16, 2010. Within 20,000 flight cycles after the replacement, do eddy current inspections as required by paragraph (g) of this AD.

Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)
(h)(1) The Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the ACO, send it to the attention of the person identified in the Related Information section of this AD.

(2) Before using any approved AMOC, notify your Principal Maintenance Inspector or Principal Avionics Inspector, as appropriate, or lacking a principal inspector, your local Flight Standards District Office.

(3) An AMOC that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used for any repair required by this AD if it is approved by the Boeing Commercial Airplanes Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) that has been authorized by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO, to make those findings. For a repair method to be approved, the repair must meet the certification basis of the airplane and 14 CFR 25.571, Amendment 45, and the approval must specifically refer to this AD.

Related Information
(i) For more information about this AD, contact Roger Durbin, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles ACO, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Blvd, Lakewood, CA 90712–4137; telephone: (562) 627–5233; fax: (562) 627–5210; e-mail: roger.durbin@faa.gov.

(j) For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Data & Services Management, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, MC D800–0019, Long Beach, California 90846–0001; telephone 206–544–5000, extension 2; fax 206–766–5683; e-mail dse.boecom@boeing.com; Internet https://www.myboeingfleet.com. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, the FAA, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 16, 2010.

Ali Bahrami,
Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate,
Aircraft Certification Service.
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SUMMARY: This action proposes to interpret the application of 14 CFR 135.263 and the rest requirements of § 135.267(d) to situations in which a flight crewmember’s flight time exceeds the permissible limits due to circumstances beyond his or her control. As discussed below, the FAA issued several interpretations addressing this issue in the 1990s. However, because the proposed interpretation relies heavily on a seminal FAA interpretation issued in 2000, the proposed interpretation would supersede any previous contrary interpretations of §§ 135.263 and 135.267(d).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 24, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments identified by docket number FAA–2010–1259 using any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov and follow the online instructions for sending your comments electronically.

• Mail: Send Comments to Docket Operations, M–30; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, West Building Ground Floor, Washington, DC 20590–0004.

• Hand Delivery: Take comments to Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

• Fax: (202) 493–2251.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alex Zektser, Attorney, Regulations Division, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–3073; e-mail: Alex.Zektser@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

The FAA invites interested persons to submit written comments, data, or views concerning this proposal. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the proposal, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. To ensure the docket does not contain duplicate comments, please send only one copy of written comments, or if you are filing comments electronically, please submit your comments only one time.

The FAA will file in the docket all comments received, as well as a report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposal. Before acting on this proposal, the FAA will consider all comments received on or before the closing date for comments and any late-filed comments if it is possible to do so without incurring expense or delay. The FAA may change this proposal in light of comments received.

Availability of This Proposed Interpretation

You can get an electronic copy using the Internet by—

(1) Searching the Federal eRulemaking Portal (http://www.regulations.gov);

(2) Visiting the FAA’s Regulations and Policies Web page at http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/; or