

not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) 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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

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

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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:

96-17-08 McDonnell Douglas: Amendment 39-9717. Docket 95-NM-177-AD.

Applicability: Model DC-10-10, -15, -30, -40, and KC-10A (military) series airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC10-24-111 RO1, Revision 1, dated August 14, 1995; 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 (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 an overfrequency condition of the generator, which could result in loss of all electrical power of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, modify the AC generator control units (GCU) in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC10-24-111 RO1, Revision 1, dated August 14, 1995.

(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, 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.

(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.

(d) The modification shall be done in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC10-24-111 RO1, Revision 1, dated August 14, 1995. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1-L51 (2-60). Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, Transport Airplane Directorate, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on September 23, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 9, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-20873 Filed 8-16-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-9715; AD 96-17-06]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A310 series airplanes, that requires repetitive inspections to detect discrepancies of the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies, and replacement of any discrepant assembly with a new, like assembly. This amendment also requires replacement of all slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies with improved assemblies, which would terminate the repetitive inspections. This amendment is prompted by reports of broken or missing inner races on the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies of the slat transmission system. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent cracking of the inner race, which could cause it to break off and, consequently, allow the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies to become worn; this situation could result in failure of the shaft of the slat transmission system, and subsequent uncommanded movement of the associated slat.

DATES: Effective September 23, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of September 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

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: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Airbus Model A310 series airplanes was published in the Federal Register on May 8, 1996 (61 FR 20762). That action proposed to require repetitive visual inspections to detect discrepancies of the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies, and replacement of any discrepant assembly with a new,

like assembly. That action also proposed to require replacement of all slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies with new assemblies, which would constitute terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the two comments received.

Both commenters support the proposed rule.

Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 26 Airbus Model A310 series airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD.

It will take approximately 5 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required inspection, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the required inspection on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$7,800, or \$300 per airplane, per inspection.

It will take approximately 9 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required replacement, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Required parts will cost approximately \$48,108 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the required replacement on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$1,264,848, or \$48,648 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the 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 adopted herein will 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 final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT

Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) 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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

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

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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:

96-17-06 Airbus Industrie: Amendment 39-9715. Docket 95-NM-241-AD.

Applicability: Model A310 series airplanes, on which Airbus Modification 6022 or 6485 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 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 (c) 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 failure of the shaft of the slat transmission system, and subsequent uncommanded movement of the associated slat, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 2,000 landings or 500 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a visual inspection to detect discrepancies of the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies, in accordance

with Airbus Service Bulletin A310-27-2040, Revision 2, dated January 5, 1995.

Note 2: Airbus Service Bulletin A310-27-2040 inadvertently references LUCAS/LIEBHERR Service Bulletin 551A-27-6010 as the appropriate source for accomplishing the inspection. LUCAS/LIEBHERR Service Bulletin 551A-27-610 is the appropriate source of information.

(1) If no discrepancy is found, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 2,000 landings.

(2) If any discrepancy is detected and the groove depth on the shaft is greater than or equal to 1 mm (0.04 in.), prior to further flight, replace the discrepant bearing assembly with a new, like assembly, in accordance with the service bulletin. After replacement, repeat the visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 2,000 landings.

(3) If any discrepancy is detected and the groove depth on the shaft is less than 1 mm (0.04 in.), prior to 50 landings after accomplishing the initial inspection, replace the discrepant bearing assembly with a new, like assembly, in accordance with the service bulletin. After the replacement, repeat the visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 2,000 landings.

(b) Within 5 years after the effective date of this AD, replace the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies with new assemblies, in accordance with LUCAS/LIEBHERR Service Bulletin 523-27-M523-1, dated April 25, 1986. Accomplishment of the replacement constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD.

(c) 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.

(d) 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.

(e) The actions shall be done in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A310-27-2040, Revision 2, dated January 5, 1995, and LUCAS/LIEBHERR Service Bulletin 523-27-M523-1, dated April 25, 1986. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal

Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on September 23, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 9, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-21871 Filed 8-16-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-9716; AD 96-17-07]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 Series Airplanes Equipped With Swivel-Type Bogie Beams on the Main Landing Gears

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 series airplanes, that requires an inspection to detect cracking of the swivel bogie beam lugs, and repair, if necessary. For airplanes on which no cracking is found, this amendment also requires an inspection to detect corrosion of the swivel pin lug surfaces and bores, and modification of the forward bogie beams. This amendment is prompted by reports indicating that swivel pin lugs of the main landing gear (MLG) have failed due to cracks resulting from stress corrosion. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent such stress corrosion, which could result in failure of the swivel-type bogie beam of the MLG; this condition could result in collapse of the MLG during landing.

DATES: Effective September 23, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of September 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD 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 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los

Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mike Lee, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627-5325; fax (310) 627-5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A

proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 series airplanes was published in the Federal Register as a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking on November 1, 1995 (60 FR 55496). That action proposed to require a magnetic particle inspection to detect cracking of the swivel bogie beam lugs, and repair, if necessary. For airplanes on which no cracking is found during the magnetic particle inspection, that action also proposed to require a visual inspection to detect corrosion of the swivel pin lug surfaces and bores, and modification of the forward bogie beams.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the single comment received.

Request To Revise Proposed Compliance Times

The commenter states that the actions described in McDonnell Douglas S.B. 32-182 (the service information referenced in the proposed rule) should be accomplished at gear overhaul.

The FAA infers that the commenter requests the compliance times be revised to reflect the intervals for gear overhaul. The FAA does not concur that the compliance times need to be revised in this AD. In developing an appropriate compliance time for this AD, the FAA considered not only the manufacturer's recommendation as to an appropriate compliance time, but the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition, and the intervals for gear overhaul of the majority of affected operators. In addition, paragraph (a)(2) of the AD provides a grace period for those operators that may have accomplished a gear overhaul just prior to the effective date of this AD, or that may be required to accomplish such an overhaul soon after this AD becomes effective. However, under the provisions of paragraph (e) of the final rule, the FAA

may approve requests for adjustments to the compliance time if data are submitted to substantiate that an adjustment would provide an acceptable level of safety.

Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, including the comment noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 148 McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 97 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 83 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$483,060, or \$4,980 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the 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 adopted herein will 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 final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) 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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.