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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Airbus: Docket 95–NM–198–AD.

Applicability: Model A320–111, -211, -212, and -231 series airplanes, on which Airbus Modification 23573 (Airbus Service Bulletin A320–32–1119, Revision 1, dated June 13, 1994), has not been installed; 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 (b) 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 collapse of the main landing gear (MLG) during landing, due to failure of the forward pintle pin cross bolt, accomplish the following:

(a) Remove the existing forward pintle nut and cross bolt; and install a new nylon spacer and post-mod cross bolt and nut of the MLG, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–32–1119, Revision 1, dated June 13, 1994, at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) Prior to the accumulation of 20,000 total landings, or at the next main landing gear overhaul, whichever occurs first.

(2) Within 500 landings after the effective date of this AD.

Note 2: The Airbus service bulletin references Dowty Aerospace Service Bulletin 200–32–194, Revision 1, dated October 4, 1993, as an additional source of service information for accomplishment of these procedures.

(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 3: 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 27, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–5222 Filed 3–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–150–AD]

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 all Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes. This proposal would require an eddy current inspection to detect cracks on the forward fittings in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts in the center section of the wings, and various follow-on actions. This proposal is prompted by reports of cracking in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts at the center/outer wing junction due to fatigue-related stress. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue-related cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the wings.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–150–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: Charles Huber, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2589; fax (206) 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 95–NM–150–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. 95–NM–150–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

On January 15, 1993, the FAA issued AD 93–01–24, Amendment 39–8478 (58 FR 6703, February 2, 1993), which is applicable to all Airbus Model A300 B2, B4–100, and B4–200 series airplanes. That AD requires supplemental structural inspections to detect fatigue cracking, and repair or replacement, if necessary; or the installation of specific modifications. That action was prompted by a structural reevaluation, which identified certain significant structural components to inspect for fatigue cracks as these airplanes approach and exceed the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent reduced structural integrity of these airplanes.

Since the issuance of that AD, the Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during sampling inspections required by AD 93–01–24, cracking was found in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts at the center/outer wing junction. The cracking occurred on Model A300 B2 and B4 series airplanes that had accumulated between 15,000 and 24,000 total flight cycles. The cause of such cracking has been attributed to fatigue-related stress. Such fatigue-related cracking, if not corrected, could result in reduced structural integrity of the wings.

The subject area on certain Model A300–600 series airplanes is almost identical to that on the affected Model A300 B2 and B4 series airplanes. Therefore, those Model A300–600 series airplanes may be subject to the same unsafe condition revealed on the Model A300 B2 and B4 series airplanes.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A300–57–6062, dated February 14, 1995, which describes procedures for an eddy current inspection to detect cracks on the forward fittings in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts in the center section of the wings, and various follow-on actions. (These follow-on actions include applying a sealant, eddy current inspections, and blending of cracks.) This service bulletin permits further flight, under certain conditions, with forward fittings that are cracked within certain limits. The DGAC classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 95–063–177(B), dated April 12, 1995, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

Explanation of the Proposed Rule

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.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would require an eddy current inspection to detect cracks on the forward fittings in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts in the center section of the wings, and various follow-on actions. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

Differences Between the Proposed Rule and Relevant Service Information

Operators should note that, unlike the procedures described in the referenced service bulletin, this proposed AD would not permit further flight with cracking detected in the forward fittings. The FAA has determined that, due to the safety implications and consequences associated with such cracking under certain conditions, the subject forward fittings that are found to be cracked must be repaired. In addition, if any crack is removed and the blend out is greater than 50 mm long and/or 2 mm deep, the forward fitting must be repaired. These repairs would be required to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA.

In addition, the service bulletin specifies that inspection thresholds and intervals should be adjusted based on the average utilization rate of the airplane. However, the FAA has determined that, in some cases, such adjustments would not address the unsafe condition in a timely manner. Therefore, this proposed AD does not permit such adjustments. In developing the appropriate inspection thresholds and intervals for the proposed rule, the FAA considered not only the manufacturer's recommendation and the average utilization rate of the affected U.S. registered airplanes, but the safety implications involved with cracking in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts at the center/outer wing junction. In light of these factors, the FAA finds the compliance times specified in the proposed AD for initiating the required actions to be warranted, in that they represent an appropriate interval of time allowable for the affected airplanes to continue to operate without compromising safety.

Furthermore, the service bulletin specifies that operators need not count touch-and-go landings in determining the total number of landings between two consecutive inspections, even if those landings are less than five percent of the landings between inspection intervals. Since fatigue cracking that was found in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts at the center/outer wing is aggravated by landing, the FAA finds that all touch-and-go landings must be counted in determining the total number of landings between two consecutive inspections.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 35 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 22 work hours 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 $46,200, or $1,320 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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 95–NM–150–AD.

Applicability: All Model 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 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 fatigue-related cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing, accomplish the following:

(a) Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracks on the forward fittings in the radius of frame 40 adjacent to the tension bolts in the center section of the wings, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6062, dated February 14, 1995, at the applicable time specified in either paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) For airplanes that have accumulated 12,400 total landings or less as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect prior to the accumulation of 10,500 total landings, or within 1,500 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes that have accumulated more than 12,400 total landings as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect within 750 landings after the effective date of this AD.

(b) If no crack is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, apply sealant, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6062, dated February 14, 1995. Repeat the eddy current inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 4,500 landings.

(c) If any crack is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, blend it out in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6062, dated February 14, 1995. Prior to further flight after accomplishing the blend out, perform an eddy current inspection to verify that the crack has been removed, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(1) If any crack is removed and the blend out is equal to or less than 50 mm long and/or 2 mm deep, repeat the eddy current inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 950 landings.

(2) If any crack exists, or if any crack is removed and the blend out is more than 50 mm long and/or 2 mm deep, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(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, Standardization Branch, ANM–113. 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.

(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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 27, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–5221 Filed 3–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95–AGL–21]

Establishment of Class D Airspace; Minneapolis, Anoka, MN

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to establish Class D airspace at Anoka County-Blaine Airport, Anoka, MN. Class D airspace is needed during the specific times that the Anoka County-Blaine Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) is in operation. The intended effect of this proposal is to provide segregation of aircraft using instrument approach procedures in instrument conditions from other aircraft operating in visual weather conditions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 25, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, AGL–7, Rules Docket No. 95–AGL–21, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Air Traffic Division, System Management Branch, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter H. Salmon, Air Traffic Division, System Management Branch, AGL–530, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018, telephone (708) 294–7568.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking