

If any disbonding is detected on any fuselage skin panel, its repair would be required to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 50 de Havilland Model DHC-7 series airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 18 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspections, 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 \$54,000, or \$1,080 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:

De Havilland, Inc.: Docket 95-NM-264-AD.

Applicability: Model DHC-7 series airplanes, serial numbers 003 through 113 inclusive, 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 disbonding of the skin panels of the fuselage, which could result in degradation of the structural capability of the airplane fuselage, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, perform a non-destructive inspection to detect disbonding of the fuselage skin panels, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Bombardier Service Bulletin S.B. 7-51-1, Revision 'A', dated March 31, 1995.

(1) If no disbonding is detected, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3 years.

(2) If any disbonding is detected, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate.

(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, New York ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the New York 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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 14, 1996.

S. R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-12602 Filed 5-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-54-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Beech (Raytheon) Model Hawker 1000 and BAe 125-1000A Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the superseding of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to Beech (Raytheon) Model Hawker 1000 and BAe 125-1000A series airplanes, that currently requires inspections to detect various discrepancies of the fuel hose assemblies on the auxiliary power unit (APU), and correction of any discrepancy found. That AD was prompted by several reports of heat damage to the fuel hose assembly on the APU. This action would add a requirement to replace the existing conduit of the fuel feed hose with new improved conduit, which would terminate the repetitive inspections. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent failure of a fuel hose due to heat damage caused by incorrect routing or bleed air leakage; such failure could result in a malfunction of the APU, a fuel fire in the fuselage rear equipment bay, and reduced structural integrity of the surrounding structure.

DATES: Comments must be received by July 1, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96-NM-54-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 Beech Aircraft Corporation, Hawker Customer Support Department, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201-0085. This

information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karl Schletzbaum, Aerospace Engineer, ACE-116W, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas; telephone (316) 946-4146; fax (316) 946-4407.

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-54-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-54-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

On April 27, 1995, the FAA issued AD 95-10-01, amendment 39-9218 (60 FR 22501, May 8, 1995), applicable to certain Beech (Raytheon) Model Hawker 1000 and BAe 125-1000A series airplanes, to require inspections to detect various discrepancies of the fuel hose assemblies on the auxiliary power

unit (APU), and correction of any discrepancy found. That action was prompted by several reports of heat damage to the fuel hose assembly on the APU. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent failure of a fuel hose due to heat damage caused by incorrect routing or bleed air leakage; such failure could result in a malfunction of the APU, a fuel fire in the fuselage rear equipment bay, and reduced structural integrity of the surrounding structure.

Actions Since Issuance of AD 95-10-01

Since the issuance of that AD, the FAA has reviewed and approved Beech (Hawker/Raytheon) Service Bulletin SB.49-47-25A825A, dated August 1, 1995, which describes procedures for the replacement of existing vinyl conduit (Pt. No. SLV-40-1½) of the fuel feed hose for the APU with a new improved conduit (Pt. No. 20 97 04415). The new conduit is made from convoluted PTFE (a commercial fluoro plastic tubing), which can withstand temperatures of up to 240 degrees Centigrade. Accomplishment of this replacement eliminates the need for repetitive inspections, as described in Raytheon Service Bulletin SB 49-44, dated January 20, 1995 (which was cited in AD 95-10-01 as the appropriate source of service information).

FAA's Conclusions

The FAA has determined that replacement of the existing conduit with convoluted PTFE tubing will positively address the unsafe condition identified as failure of a fuel hose due to heat damage caused by incorrect routing or bleed air leakage; such failure could result in a malfunction of the APU, a fuel fire in the fuselage rear equipment bay, and reduced structural integrity of the surrounding structure.

Explanation of the Requirements of the 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 supersede AD 95-10-01. It would continue to require inspections to detect various discrepancies of the fuel hose assemblies on the auxiliary power unit (APU), and correction of any discrepancy found. However, this proposed AD also would add a new requirement to replace the existing vinyl conduit of the fuel feed hose for the APU with a new improved conduit, which would constitute terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements. The new action would be required to be accomplished in

accordance with Beech (Hawker/Raytheon) Service Bulletin SB.49-47-25A825A, dated August 1, 1995, as described previously.

The FAA has determined that long term continued operational safety will be better assured by modifications or design changes to remove the source of the problem, rather than by repetitive inspections. Long term inspections may not be providing the degree of safety assurance necessary for the transport airplane fleet. This, coupled with a better understanding of the human factors associated with numerous repetitive inspections, has led the FAA to consider placing less emphasis on special procedures and more emphasis on design improvements. The proposed modification requirement is in consonance with these considerations.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 48 Beech Model Hawker 1000 and BAe 125-1000A series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 31 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The actions that are currently required by AD 95-10-01 take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact on U.S. operators of the actions currently required is estimated to be \$1,860, or \$60 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The new actions that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 4 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$218 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact on U.S. operators of the new proposed requirements of this AD is estimated to be \$14,198, or \$458 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the current or 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 removing amendment 39-9218 (60 FR 22501, May 8, 1995), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Beech Aircraft Corporation (formerly DeHavilland; Hawker Siddeley; British Aerospace, plc; Raytheon Corporate Jets, Inc.): Docket 96-NM-54-AD. Supersedes AD 95-10-01, Amendment 39-9218.

Applicability: Model Hawker 1000 and BAe 125-1000A series airplanes, post modification 259722C, 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.

Note 2: Beech (Raytheon) Model BAe 125-1000B series airplanes are similar in design to the airplanes that are subject to the requirements of this AD and, therefore, also may be subject to the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. However, as of the effective date of this AD, those models are not type certificated for operation in the United States. Airworthiness authorities of countries in which the Model BAe 125-1000B series airplanes are approved for operation should consider adopting corrective action, applicable to those models, that is similar to the corrective action required by this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of a fuel hose assembly on the auxiliary power unit (APU), which could result in a malfunction of the APU, a potential fuel fire in the fuselage rear bay, and reduced structural integrity of the surrounding structure, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 30 days after May 23, 1995 (the effective date of AD 95-10-01, amendment 39-9218), perform inspections to detect discrepancies of the fuel feed hose assemblies on the APU; an inspection to assure proper positioning of the air leak detection system; and an inspection of the bleed air system for signs of leakage; in accordance with paragraph 2.B. of the Accomplishment Instructions of Raytheon Service Bulletin SB 49-44, dated January 20, 1995.

(1) If no discrepancy is found: Thereafter, following the last flight of each day, perform an inspection to detect discoloration of the fuel hose assembly (outlet from the fuel pump box) on the APU, in accordance with paragraph 2.B.(2) and 2.C. of the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin.

(2) If any discrepancy is found, prior to further flight, correct the discrepancy in accordance with paragraph 2.B. of the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin.

(b) Within 200 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, replace the existing conduit of the fuel feed hose for the auxiliary power unit (APU) with new improved conduit (modification 25A825A), in accordance with Beech (Raytheon/Hawker) Service Bulletin SB.49-47-25A825A, dated August 1, 1995. Accomplishment of the replacement constitutes terminating action for 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, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Small 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, Wichita ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Wichita ACO.

(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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 14, 1996.

S.R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-12601 Filed 5-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 158

[Docket No. 27791; Notice No. 96-3A]

RIN 2120-AF69

Passenger Facility Charges

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM); extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document announces an extension of the comment period on The ANPRM entitled, "Passenger Facility Charges" (61 FR 16678; April 16, 1996). This comment period is extended from May 16, 1996, until August 16, 1996. The extension responds to the request of the Air Transport Association of America (ATA) and is needed to permit ATA, and other affected parties, additional time to develop comments responsive to the ANPRM.

DATES: The comment period is being extended from May 16, 1996, to August 16, 1996.

ADDRESSES: As stated in Notice No. 96-3, comments should be mailed or delivered in triplicate, to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attn: Rules Docket (AGC-200), Docket No. 27791, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. Comments delivered must be marked Docket No. 27791. Comments may be examined in Room 915G on weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sheryl Scarborough, Passenger Facility Charge Branch (App-530), Airports Financial Assistance Division, Office of Airports Planning and Programming, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 267-8825.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 16, 1996, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued Notice No. 96-3, entitled "Passenger Facility