Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 66, No. 159
Thursday, August 16, 2001

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NE–50–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International, Inc., (formerly AlliedSignal, Inc., Textron Lycoming, Avco Lycoming, and Lycoming) Former Military T53 Series Turboshaft Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Honeywell International, Inc., (formerly AlliedSignal, Inc., Textron Lycoming, Avco Lycoming, and Lycoming) former military T53 series turboshaft engines (herein referred to as Lycoming) having certain part numbers of centrifugal compressor impellers installed. This proposal would require conducting a revised operating cycle count (prorate) and initial and repetitive inspections for cracks of those compressor impellers. This proposal is prompted by a report of a military surplus helicopter that experienced low-cycle fatigue failure of the centrifugal compressor impeller, resulting in an uncontained engine failure. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent centrifugal compressor impeller failure, which can result in an uncontained engine failure, in-flight engine shutdown, or damage to the helicopter.

DATES: Comments must be received by October 15, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NE–50–AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: 9-ane-adcomment@faa.gov''. Comments sent via the Internet must contain the docket number in the subject line. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Honeywell International, Inc., Attn: Data Distribution, M/S 64–3/2101–201, P.O. Box 29003, Phoenix, AZ 85038–9003; telephone: (602) 365–2493; fax:(602) 365–5577. This information may be examined at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Baitoo, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, CA 90712–4137; telephone: (562) 627–5245, fax: (562) 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 should 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 action 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 action must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 2000–NE–50–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NE–50–AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299.

Discussion

The FAA has become aware of a Lycoming former military T53 series turboshaft engine, installed on a Bell Helicopter Textron manufactured UH–1L military surplus helicopter, that experienced low-cycle fatigue failure of the centrifugal compressor impeller, resulting in an uncontained engine failure. In May 1995, the FAA published AD 95–10–04, dated May 25, 1995, to revise operating cycle counts (prorate) and require initial and repetitive inspections for cracks, for centrifugal compressor impellers, part numbers (P/N's) 1–100–78–07 and 1–100–078–08, installed on Lycoming former military T5313B and T5317 series turboshaft engines. Because centrifugal compressor impellers P/N's 1–100–78–07 and 1–100–078–08 are also installed on Lycoming former military T53 series engines, this proposal would require revising operating cycle counts (prorate) and require initial and repetitive inspections for cracks for centrifugal compressor impellers P/N's 1–100–078–07 and 1–100–078–08, installed on Lycoming former military T53 series turboshaft engines. This proposal is prompted by a report of a military surplus helicopter that experienced low-cycle fatigue failure of the centrifugal compressor impeller, resulting in an uncontained engine failure. These impellers, if not inspected for cracks using a revised cycle count could experience low-cycle fatigue failure, resulting in an uncontained engine failure, in-flight shutdown, or damage to the helicopter.

Manufacturer's Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of Honeywell International, Inc. Service Bulletins (SB's) T53–L–13B–0020, Revision 2, dated April 25, 2001; T53-L–13B/D–0020, Revision 1, dated April 25, 2001;

and T53–L–703–0020, Revision 1, dated April 25, 2001; that describe procedures for conducting a revised centrifugal compressor impeller operating cycle count (prorate) of impellers P/N's 1–100–078–07 and 1–100–078–08. The FAA has also reviewed and approved the technical contents of AlliedSignal, Inc. SB's T53–L–13B–0108, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1999; T53–L–13B/D–0108, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1999; and T53–L–703–0108, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1999; that describe procedures for special visual and fluorescent-penetrant inspections of centrifugal compressor impellers P/N's 1–100–078–07 and 1–100–078–08.

Proposed Actions

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other engines of the same type design, the proposed AD would require initial and repetitive inspections of centrifugal compressor impellers, using a revised cycle count. The actions would be required to be done in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

Economic Impact

The FAA estimates that there are approximately 300 Lycoming former military T53 series turboshaft engines installed on helicopters of U.S. registry, that would be affected by this proposed AD. The FAA also estimates that it would take approximately 8 work hours per engine to accomplish an initial or repetitive inspection of the centrifugal compressor impeller, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. No additional work hour cost would be incurred if the centrifugal compressor impeller is replaced during normal engine disassembly. Based on these figures, the total labor cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators for an inspection is estimated to be $144,000. The FAA estimates that operators will perform two inspections annually, and that the total annual labor cost for inspections is estimated to be $288,000. The cost of a replacement centrifugal compressor impeller is estimated to be $22,037. Assuming a loss of 50% of the life of each disk by the prorate, the total annual cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $3,593,550.

Regulatory Impact

This proposal does not have federalism implications, as defined in Executive Order 13132, because it 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. Accordingly, the FAA has not consulted with state authorities prior to publication of this proposal.

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:

Honeywell International, Inc. Docket 2000–NE–50–AD.

Applicability

This airworthiness directive (AD) is applicable to Honeywell International, Inc., (formerly AlliedSignal, Inc., Textron Lycoming, Avco Lycoming, and Lycoming) (herein referred to as Lycoming) former military T53–L–13B series, T53–L–13B/D series, and T53–L–703 series turboshaft engines with centrifugal compressor impellers part numbers (P/N's) 1–100–078–07 or 1–100–078–08 installed. These Lycoming engines are installed on, but not limited to, Bell Helicopter Textron manufactured AH–1, UH–1, and SW–204/205 (UH–1) series surplus military helicopters that have been certified in accordance with §§ 21.25 or 21.27 of the Federal Aviation regulations (14 CFR 21.25 or 21.27).

Note 1: This AD applies to each engine 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 engines 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

Compliance with this AD is required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent centrifugal compressor impeller failure, which can result in an uncontained engine failure, in-flight engine shutdown, or damage to the helicopter, accomplish the following:

Centrifugal Compressor Impeller Revised Operating Cycle Count

(a) Within 25 operating cycles or 7 calendar days, whichever occurs first, after the effective date of this AD, do a revised centrifugal compressor impeller operating cycle count (prorate) in accordance with the accomplishment instructions of Honeywell International, Inc. Service Bulletin (SB) No. T53–L–13B–0020, Revision 2, dated April 25, 2001 for T53–L–13B Lycoming engines, SB No. T53–L–13B/D–0020, Revision 1, dated April 25, 2001 for T53–L–13B/D Lycoming engines, and SB No. T53–L–703–0020, Revision 1, dated April 25, 2001 for T53–L–703 Lycoming engines.

(b) Following the revised operating cycle count required by paragraph (a) of this AD, remove from service installed centrifugal compressor impellers that exceed their life limit or whose life cannot be determined, within 50 hours time-in-service (TIS), or 25 operating cycles, whichever occurs first and replace with a serviceable part that does not exceed the life limit.

(c) Installation of uninstalled centrifugal compressor impellers that exceed their life limit, which is revised in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD is prohibited.

Centrifugal Compressor Impeller Inspections

(d) Following the revised operating cycle count required by paragraph (a) of this AD, inspect centrifugal compressor impellers, part numbers (P/N's) 1–100–078–07 and 1–100–078–08, in accordance with the accomplishment instructions of AlliedSignal, Inc. SB No. T53–L–13B–0108, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1999 for T53–L–13B Lycoming engines, SB No. T53–L–13B/D–0108, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1999 for T53–L–13B/D Lycoming engines, or SB No. T53–L–703–0108, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1999 for T53–L–703 Lycoming engines, as follows:

(1) For centrifugal compressor impellers with equal to or greater than 4,600 cycles-in-service (CIS), initially inspect within 200 CIS after the effective date of this AD.

(2) For those centrifugal compressor impellers with less than 4,600 CIS, initially inspect no later than 4,800 CIS.

(3) Centrifugal compressor impellers found cracked must be removed from service prior

to further flight and replaced with a serviceable part.

(4) If no cracks are detected, perform repetitive inspections of the centrifugal compressor impellers at intervals not to exceed 500 CIS since last inspection.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO). Operators must 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 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(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.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on August 7, 2001.

Diane S. Romanosky,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–20591 Filed 8–15–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD08–01–022]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Pontchartrain, LA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to change the drawbridge operation regulation for the draw of the Greater New Orleans Expressway Commission Causeway across Lake Pontchartrain between Metairie, Jefferson Parish and Mandeville, St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana. The proposed rule would allow the dual bridges to remain closed to navigation during the morning and afternoon rush hours while still requiring three hours notification at all other times.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 15, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to Commander (ob), Eighth Coast Guard District, 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130–3396, or deliver them to room 1313 at the same address above between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Bridge Administration Branch, Eighth Coast Guard District between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Frank, Bridge Administration Branch, at the address given above or telephone (504) 589–2965.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested parties to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this rulemaking (CGD08–01–022) and the specific section of this document to which each comment applies and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you would like confirmation of receipt of your comments, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of comments received.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. You may submit a request for a public meeting by writing to the Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why a public meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that a public meeting would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place to be announced by notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The bascule span of the dual bridges of the Greater New Orleans Expressway Commission Causeway across Lake Pontchartrain presently opens on signal if at least three hours notice is given. The Greater New Orleans Expressway Commission has requested a change in the operating schedule of the dual bridges to allow the draw to remain closed during peak vehicular traffic periods. Approximately 15,000 vehicles cross the dual bridges in each direction daily. Of the nearly 15,000 vehicles that cross the southbound bridge from St. Tammany Parish to Jefferson Parish, approximately 50% of these vehicles cross this bridge between the hours of 5:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. Of the nearly 15,000 vehicles that cross the northbound bridge from Jefferson Parish to St. Tammany Parish, approximately 50% of these vehicles cross this bridge between the hours of 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. During these peak traffic periods, an opening of the draw can cause traffic to back up approximately four to five miles.

Tender logs for the past year indicate that only six vessels have required the draw to open during these times.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The proposed rule would modify the existing regulation in 33 CFR 117.467(b) to require the draw of the Greater New Orleans Expressway Commission Causeway to open on signal if at least three hours notice is given; except that, the draw need not be opened for the passage of vessels Monday through Friday except Federal holidays from 5:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and from 3 p.m. until 7 p.m. The draw will open on signal for any vessel in distress or vessel waiting immediately following the closures listed above.

The draw of the Causeway at the north channel has a vertical clearance of 42 feet above mean high water in the closed-to-navigation position and unlimited clearance in the open-to-navigation position. Navigation on the waterway consists of small tugs with tows, fishing vessels, sailing vessels, and other recreational craft. As an alternate route, the south channel fixed spans of the dual bridges provides a vertical clearance of 50 feet above mean high water.

The Coast Guard believes that allowing the draw to remain closed to navigation during the morning and afternoon peak vehicular traffic time periods is reasonable and will still meet the needs of navigation. This conclusion is based upon the low number of opening requests received during these time periods.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under