flight, replace any loose pin, in accordance with the service bulletin and accomplish the following, as applicable:

- (1) For any piston on which three threaded screw pins are installed: No further action is required by this AD for this piston.
- (2) For any piston on which one pin is installed and two holes are sealed with epoxy: Remove the epoxy, and install two additional threaded screw pins, in accordance with the service bulletin. Thereafter, no further action is required by this AD for this piston.
- (3) For any piston on which one pin is installed and no other holes exist:
- (i) Repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD at intervals not to exceed 600 hours time-in-service until the modification required by paragraph (a)(3)(ii) of this AD is accomplished.
- (ii) Prior to the accumulation of 1,800 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD, or within 3 years after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, modify this piston in accordance with the service bulletin. Accomplishment of this modification constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraph (a)(3)(i) of this AD. Thereafter, no further action is required by this AD with regard to that piston.
- (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, 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.

(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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 28, 1997.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service. [FR Doc. 97–5574 Filed 3–6– 97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-201-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-90-30 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 McDonnell Douglas Model MD-90-30 airplanes. This proposal would require revising the Airworthiness Limitations Section of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness [MD-90-30] Airworthiness Limitations Instructions (ALI)]. The revision would incorporate certain compliance times for inspections to detect fatigue cracking of principal structural elements (PSE) and to add PSE's to the ALI. This proposal is prompted by analysis of data that identified reduced initial inspection thresholds, reduced repetitive inspection intervals for PSE's, and other PSE's to be added to the ALI. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to ensure that fatigue cracking of various PSE's are detected and corrected; such fatigue cracking could adversely affect the structural integrity of these airplanes.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 16, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96-NM-201-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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brent Bandley, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood,

California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5237; 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 96–NM–201–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. 96-NM-201-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

In accordance with airworthiness standards requiring "damage tolerance assessments" [reference current section 1529 of parts 23, 25, 27, and 29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR); section 4 of parts 33 and 35 of the FAR; section 82 of part 31 of the FAR; and the Appendices referenced in those sections], all products certificated to comply with those sections must have Instructions for Continued Airworthiness (or, for some products, maintenance manuals), that include an Airworthiness Limitations Section. That section must set forth:

- mandatory replacement times for structural components,
 - structural inspection intervals, and

 related approved structural inspection procedures necessary to show compliance with the damagetolerance requirements.

Compliance with the terms specified in the Airworthiness Limitations Sections is required by FAR sections 43.16 (for persons maintaining products) and 91.403 (for operators).

As airplanes gain service experience, or as the result of post-certification testing and evaluation, it may become necessary to add additional life limits or structural inspections in order to ensure the continued structural integrity of the airplane. The manufacturer may revise the Airworthiness Limitations Section to include new or more restrictive life limits and inspections. However, in order to require compliance with those revised life limits and/or inspection intervals, the FAA must engage in rulemaking.

Because loss of structural integrity would result in an unsafe condition, it is appropriate to impose these requirements through the AD process.

Actions Taken by the Manufacturer

McDonnell Douglas recently has completed extensive analyses and testing of fatigue cracking of Principal Structural Elements (PSE) on Model MD-90-30 airplanes, which included:

- crack growth analysis,
- · service experience analysis,
- crack growth testing,
- fatigue testing, and
- analysis of the effectiveness of applicable non-destructive inspection techniques to detect cracking and other anomalies.

The analyses and testing were similar to methods used to develop the initial MD–90 Airworthiness Limitations Instructions (ALI), Document No. MDC–94K9000, dated November 1994.

The results of the testing and analyses demonstrated the need to revise certain inspections contained in the current ALI.

New Revisions of Airworthiness Limitations Instructions (ALI)

The FAA has reviewed and approved MD–90 ALI, Revision 1, dated January 1995, and Revision 2, dated July 1996. These revisions describe specific reduced initial inspection thresholds and reduced repetitive inspection intervals for certain PSE's. They also include additional PSE's to be inspected.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

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 operators to revise the MD–90 ALI to incorporate Revision 1, dated January 1995, and Revision 2, dated July 1996.

Explanation of Action Taken by the FAA

As stated previously, in order to require compliance with these inspection intervals and life limits, the FAA must engage in rulemaking, namely the issuance of an AD. For products certificated to comply with the referenced part 25 requirements, it is within the authority of the FAA to issue an AD requiring a revision to the Airworthiness Limitations Section that includes reduced life limits, or new or different structural inspection requirements. These revisions then are mandatory for operators under section 91.403(c) of the FAR, which prohibits operation of an airplane for which Airworthiness Limitations have been issued unless the inspection intervals specified in those limitations have been complied with.

Once that document is revised, as required, and the AD has been fully complied with, the life limit or structural inspection change remains enforceable as a part of the Airworthiness Limitations. (This is analogous to AD's that require changes to the Limitations Section of the Airplane Flight Manual.)

Requiring a revision of the Airworthiness Limitations, rather than requiring individual inspections, is advantageous for operators because it allows them to record AD compliance status only once—at the time they make the revision—rather than after every inspection. It also has the advantage of keeping all Airworthiness Limitations, whether imposed by original certification or by AD, in one place within the operator's maintenance program, thereby reducing the risk of non-compliance because of oversight or confusion.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 15 Model MD–90 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 11 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 work hour 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 \$660, or \$60 per airplane.

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.

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:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 96–NM–201–

Applicability: All Model MD–90–30 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 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 ensure continued structural integrity of these airplanes, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 180 days after the effective date of this AD, revise the Airworthiness Limitations Section of the Instructions for

Continued Airworthiness [Airworthiness Limitations Instructions (ALI), McDonnell Douglas Report No. MDC–94K9000, dated November 1994] to incorporate the Item, Location, and Inspection Interval of the following principal structural elements: This may be accomplished by inserting a copy of Revision 1 of the ALI, dated January 1995, or a copy of this AD into the ALI.

| ltem | Location | Inspection interval (in landings) | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------|
| | | Initial | Repeat |
| Item 53.30.02.3 | Skin Panels, STA 237 to 1395 Fuselage Skin in Constant Section from Longeron 3 Left to Longeron 3 Right. | 60,000 | 11,000 |
| Item 53.30.02.4 | Skin Panels, STA 237 to 1395 Fuselage Hoop Skin Splice in Constant Section from Longeron 5 Left to Longeron 5 Right. | 60,000 | 30,000 |
| Item 54.10.04.1 | Thrust Bulkhead, Pylon—STA Yn 170.5—Rear Spar and Engine Thrust Support Fitting (Upper and Lower). | 15,000 | 4,500 |

(b) Within 180 days after the effective date of this AD, revise the Airworthiness Limitations Section of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness [Airworthiness Limitations Instructions (ALI), McDonnell Douglas Report No. MDC–94K9000, dated November 1994] to incorporate the Item, Location, and Inspection Interval of the following principal structural elements: This may be accomplished by inserting a copy of Revision 2 to the ALI, dated July 1996, or a copy of this AD into the ALI.

| Item | Location | Inspection interval (in landings) | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------|
| | | Initial | Repeat |
| Item 55.13.01.1 | Plates/Skin—Upper STA Xh 27.2 Left to Xh 27.2 Right—Upper Aft Skin Plank with Integral Stringers from Xh 7.234 to Xh 26.859. | 60,000 | 8,100 |

- (c) Except as provided in paragraph (d) of this AD: After the actions specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this AD have been accomplished, no alternative inspections or inspection intervals may be approved for the parts specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) 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 Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 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, 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 §§ 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 February 28, 1997.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service. [FR Doc. 97–5573 Filed 3–6–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-203-AD] RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) 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 McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 and DC–9–80 series airplanes, Model MD–88 airplanes, and C–9 (military) series

airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive high frequency eddy current inspections of the external areas of the fuselage to detect cracks of the skin and/ or longeron, and various follow-on actions. The proposal also would require the installation of a preventative modification, which would terminate the repetitive inspections. This proposal is prompted by reports indicating that, due to material fatigue caused by installation preload and cabin pressurization cycles, fatigue cracks were found in the skin and longerons of the fuselage. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracks, which could result in loss of the structural integrity of the fuselage and, consequently, lead to rapid depressurization of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 16, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No.96–NM–203–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this