*not been modified*, prior to further flight, perform a low frequency eddy current (LFEC) or x-ray inspection to detect cracks at all corners and doorstops of the forward passenger door doorjamb, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–280, dated December 1, 1997.

(1) Group 1, Condition 1. If no crack is detected during any LFEC or x-ray inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, accomplish the requirements of either paragraph (b)(1)(i) or (b)(1)(ii) of this AD, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) *Option 1.* Repeat the LFEC inspection required by this paragraph thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,575 landings, or the x-ray inspection required by this paragraph thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,075 landings; or

(ii) *Option 2.* Prior to further flight, modify the doorstops and corners of the forward passenger door doorjamb, in accordance with the service bulletin. Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, perform a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(A) If no crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this AD, repeat the HFEC inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(B) If any crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (b)(1)(ii) 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.

(2) Group 1, Condition 2. If any crack is found during any LFEC or x-ray inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, and the crack is 0.50 inch or less in length: Prior to further flight, modify the doorstops and corners of the forward passenger door doorjamb in accordance with the service bulletin. Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, perform a HFEC inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If no crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (b)(2) of this AD, repeat the HFEC inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(ii) If any crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (b)(2) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(3) Group 1, Condition 3. If any crack is found during any LFEC or x-ray inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, and the crack is greater than 0.5 inch in length: Prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(c) Group 2, Condition 1. For airplanes identified as Group 2 in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC–9–53–280, dated December 1, 1997: If the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD reveals that the doorstops and corners of the forward passenger door doorjamb have been modified previously in accordance with the McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Structural Repair Manual (SRM), using a steel doubler, accomplish either paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC–9–53–280, dated December 1, 1997.

(1) *Option 1.* Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, or within 3,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a HFEC inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If no crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (c)(1) of this AD, repeat the HFEC inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(ii) If any crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC 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 ACO.

(2) *Option 2.* Prior to further flight, modify the doorstops and corners of the forward passenger door doorjamb in accordance with the service bulletin. Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after the accomplishment of the modification, perform a HFEC inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If no crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (c)(2) of this AD, repeat the HFEC inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(ii) If any crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (c)(2) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(d) Group 2, Condition 2. For airplanes identified as Group 2 in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–280, dated December 1, 1997: If the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD reveals that the doorstops and corners of the forward passenger door doorjamb *have been modified* previously in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 SRM or Service Rework Drawing, using an aluminum doubler, prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after the accomplishment of the modification, or within 3,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a HFEC inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–280, dated December 1, 1997

(1) If no crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (d) of this AD, repeat the HFEC inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(2) If any crack is detected on the skin adjacent to the modification during any HFEC inspection required by paragraph (d) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(e) Group 2, Condition 3. For airplanes identified as Group 2 in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–280, dated December 1, 1997: If the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD reveals that the doorstops and corners of the forward passenger door doorjamb *have been modified previously*, but not in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC9 SRM or the Service Rework Drawing, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

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

(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.

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

**Darrell M. Pederson,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 98–10277 Filed 4–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. 98–NM–74–AD]**

**RIN 2120–AA64**

## Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, and 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 series airplanes and all Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive

inspections for wear damage of the aft attachment fittings of the articulated seats and dummy tracks in the passenger compartment; and repair, 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 wear damage of the aft attachment fittings of the articulated seats and dummy tracks. This condition, if not detected and corrected, could cause the floor panels to sag and result in failure of flight control systems and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by May 20, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–74–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–74–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–74–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 series airplanes, and all Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that it has received reports indicating that, on in-service airplanes, wear damage was found between frames 38.2 and 40 and between frames 54 and 54.2 on the aft attachment fittings of the articulated seats and dummy tracks in the passenger compartment. Investigation has revealed that, under certain load conditions, such as take-off and landing, the sliders of the articulated seats may cause excessive wear of the dummy track slot contact surface. This excessive wear restricts the sliding movement of the articulated seats and can lead to cracking and rupture of the attachment fitting. This condition, if not detected and corrected, could cause the floor panels to sag and result in failure of flight control systems and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

### Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Airbus has issued Service Bulletins A300–53–0329, Revision 01 (for Model A300); A300–53–6105, Revision 01 (for Model A300–600); and A310–53–2101, Revision 01 (for Model A310); all dated October 17, 1997. These service bulletins describe procedures for repetitive detailed visual inspections for wear damage of the aft attachment fittings of the articulated seats and dummy tracks between frames 38.2 and 40 and between frames 54 and 54.2 in the passenger compartment; and repair, if necessary. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletins is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition. The DGAC classified these service bulletins as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 97–116–222(B), dated May 21, 1997, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

### FAA's Conclusions

These airplanes model are manufactured in France and are 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 bulletins described previously, except as discussed below.

### Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin

Operators should note that, unlike the procedures described in Airbus Service Bulletins A300–53–0329, Revision 01 (for Model A300); Airbus A300–53–6105, Revision 01 (for Model A300–600), and Airbus A310–53–2101, Revision 01 (for Model A310), all dated October 17, 1997, this proposed AD would not permit further flight if wear damage is detected on the aft attachment fittings on the articulated seats and dummy tracks in the passenger compartment. The FAA has determined that, because of the safety implications and consequences associated with such wear damage, any subject attachment fitting that is found to exhibit wear damage must be repaired prior to further flight.

In addition, operators should note that, although the referenced service bulletins specify 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 126 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. It would take approximately 48 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $362,880, or $2,880 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.

### 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–74–AD.

*Applicability:* Model A300 series airplanes on which Airbus Modification 3599 or 3135 (reference Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–0188) has been accomplished, and all Model A310 and A300–600 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 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 (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 as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To detect and correct wear damage of the aft attachment fittings of the articulated seats and dummy tracks in the passenger compartment, which could cause the floor panels to sag and result in failure of flight control systems and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Perform a detailed visual inspection for wear damage of the aft attachment fittings of the articulated seats and dummy tracks in the passenger compartment, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletins A300–53–0329, Revision 01 (for Airbus Model A300 series airplanes); A300–53–6105, Revision 01 (for Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes); or A310–53–2101, Revision 01 (for Airbus Model A310 series airplanes), all dated October 17, 1997; at the applicable time specified in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) For airplanes that have accumulated less than 12,000 total flight cycles as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect prior to the accumulation of 6,000 total flight cycles, or within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes that have accumulated 12,000 or more total flight cycles as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect within 12 months after the effective date of this AD.

(b) If no wear damage is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, repeat the detailed visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 6,000 flight cycles.

(c) If any wear damage measuring 2 mm (0.078 in.) or less is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletins A300–53–0329, Revision 01 (for Airbus Model A300 series airplanes); A300–53–6105, Revision 01 (for Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes); or A310–53–2101, Revision 01 (for Airbus Model A310 series airplanes); all dated October 17, 1997. Repeat the detailed visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 6,000 flight cycles.

(d) If any wear damage measuring more than 2 mm (0.078 in.) is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Repeat the detailed visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 6,000 flight cycles.

(e) 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.

(f) 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 97–116–222(B), dated May 21, 1997.

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

**Darrell M. Pederson,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 98–10279 Filed 4–17–98; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–U**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. 98–NM–25–AD]**

**RIN 2120–AA64**

## Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 200, Fan Jet Falcon, and Mystere-Falcon 20 Series Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness