Note 2: Where there are differences between the service bulletin and the AD, the AD prevails.

Note 3: The words "repair" and "modify/modification" in this AD and the referenced service bulletin are used interchangeably.

Note 4: This AD will affect Principal Structural Element (PSE) 53.09.023 of the DC–9 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)

- (a) Prior to the accumulation of 41,000 total landings, or within 3,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a one-time visual inspection to determine if the corners of the upper cargo doorjamb have been modified prior to the effective date of this AD.
- (b) If the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD reveals that the corners of the upper cargo doorjamb have not been modified, prior to further flight, perform an x-ray inspection to detect cracks of the fuselage skin and doubler at all corners of the upper cargo doorjamb, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–276, dated September 30, 1996.
- (1) If no crack is detected during the x-ray inspection required by this paragraph, accomplish the requirements of either paragraph (b)(1)(i) or (b)(1)(ii) of this AD, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–276, dated September 30, 1996
- (i) *Option 1*. Repeat the x-ray inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,000 landings; or
- (ii) Option 2. Prior to further flight, modify the corner skin of the upper cargo doorjamb, in accordance with the service bulletin. Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, perform an eddy current 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 the eddy current inspection required by this paragraph, repeat the eddy current 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 eddy current inspection required by this paragraph, 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) If any crack is found during any x-ray inspection required by this paragraph and the crack is 2 inches or less in length: Prior to further flight, modify/repair it in accordance with the service bulletin. Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If no crack is detected during the eddy current inspection required by this paragraph, repeat the eddy current inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(ii) If any crack is detected during any eddy current inspection required by this paragraph, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(3) If any crack is found during any x-ray inspection required by this paragraph and the crack is greater than 2 inches in length: Prior to further flight, modification it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

- (c) If the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD reveals that the corners of the upper cargo doorjamb have been modified previously: Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings after accomplishment of that modification, or within 3,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracks on the skin adjacent to the modification, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–276, dated September 30, 1996
- (1) If no crack is detected during the eddy current inspection required by this paragraph, repeat the eddy current inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(2) If any crack is detected during any eddy current inspection required by this paragraph, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(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, 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.

(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 20, 1997.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service. [FR Doc. 97–4714 Filed 2–25–97; 8:45 am]

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-196-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model DH 125–1A and –3A 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 Raytheon Model DH 125-1A and -3A series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive eddy current inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the main entry door/frame pressing, and repair, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by reports of fatigue cracking of the main entry door/frame pressing due to cyclic loading of the door frame. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct such fatigue cracking, which could lead to the loss of structural integrity of the main entry door, and, consequently, result in decompression of the cabin.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 7, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–196–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 Raytheon Aircraft Company,
Commercial Service 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; or the FAA,
Wichita Aircraft Certification Office,
Small Airplane Directorate, 1801
Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent
Airport, Wichita, Kansas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry Engler, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ACE-118W, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, Small Airplane Directorate, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946-4122; 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–196–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-196-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

The FAA has received several reports of fatigue cracking of the main entry door/frame pressing of Raytheon Model DH 125–1A and –3A series airplanes. Investigation revealed that cyclic loading of the door frame caused the fatigue cracking. Such fatigue cracking, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could cause the loss of structural integrity of the main entry door, and lead to decompression of the cabin.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved Raytheon Aircraft Service Bulletin SB.52–48, dated June 19, 1996, which describes procedures for eddy current inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the main entry door/frame pressing. The service bulletin also describes procedures for repair, if necessary.

Explanation of Requirements of 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 require repetitive eddy current inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking of the main entry door/frame pressing. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with

the service bulletin described previously.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 143 Raytheon Model DH 125 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 56 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 work hour 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 \$3,360, or \$60 per airplane, per inspection.

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:

Raytheon Aircraft Company (Formerly Beech, Raytheon Corporate Jets, British Aerospace, Hawker Siddeley, et al.): Docket 96–NM–196–AD.

Applicability: Model DH 125–1A and –3A series airplanes; equipped with a main entry door having part numbers 25FC3559A, 25FC3559A/B, or 25FC3559A/C; and on which Raytheon Modification 251429 has not been accomplished; 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 detect and correct fatigue cracking of the main entry door frame pressing area, which could result in loss of structural integrity of the door and consequent decompression of the cabin, accomplish the following:

(a) Within the next 150 landings or 90 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs earlier, perform an eddy current inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the main entry door/frame pressing, in accordance with Raytheon Aircraft Service Bulletin SB.52–48, dated June 19, 1996.

(1) If no cracking is detected during the inspection, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,000 flight hours.

(2) If any cracking is detected during the inspection, prior to further flight, repair the cracking in accordance with the service bulletin.

(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, 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 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Wichita 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 February 20, 1997.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service. [FR Doc. 97–4716 Filed 2–25–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-210-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Model MU-300 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 Mitsubishi Model MU-300 airplanes. This proposal would require revising the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to provide pilots with certain operating procedures during icing conditions, and to limit the maximum flaps position for flight in icing conditions or landing after an icing encounter. The proposal also would require installing an ice detector, and accomplishing a corresponding AFM revision to address its operation. For certain airplanes, the proposal would require converting the airplane configuration or modifying the warning horn system of the landing gear; and revising the AFM to specify flaps 10 degrees as a normal landing flap configuration. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent uncommanded nose-down pitch at certain flap settings during icing conditions.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 7, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–210–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 Mitsubishi Heavy Industries America, Inc., 15303 Dallas Parkway, Suite 685, LB–77, Dallas, Texas 75248. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tina L. Miller, Aerospace Engineer, Flight Test Branch, ACE–117W, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, Small Airplane Directorate, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946–4168; 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–210–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-210-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

On December 5, 1994, the FAA issued AD 94–25–10, amendment 39–9094 (59

FR 64112, December 13, 1994), that is applicable to all Raytheon (Beech) Model 400, 400A, 400T, and MU-300-10 airplanes, and all Mitsubishi Model MU-300 airplanes, to require a revision to the FAA-approved Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to provide pilots with special operating procedures during icing conditions. That AD was prompted by results of icing tests, which demonstrated that ice accumulations on the horizontal stabilizer may cause the airplane to pitch down at certain flaps settings. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent uncommanded nose-down pitch at certain flap settings during icing conditions.

Actions Since Issuance of Previous Rule

Since the issuance of AD 94–25–10, the FAA reviewed and approved Mitsubishi MU–300 Service Bulletin No. 30–007 (including Attachment 1), dated January 12, 1996. The service bulletin describes procedures for installing a Rosemount ice detector in accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) ST00383WI.

For Diamond I airplanes, Attachment 1 of the service bulletin describes procedures for modifying the warning horn system of the landing gear. That action involves modifying the center pedestal and the wiring of the warning horn, installing a switch panel assembly on the center pedestal, and performing a functional test of the warning horn system of the landing gear.

As an alternative to this modification, the service bulletin specifies that Diamond I airplanes may be converted to the Diamond IA airplane configuration by accomplishing Mitsubishi MU–300 Diamond Service Recommendation SR–001, Revision 2, dated June 1, 1984. That action involves upgrading the airplane to conform to an improved performance configuration, and includes modifications of the air conditioning system, the pitch trim indicator, the warning horn of the landing gear, and the engine indicating system.

Mitsubishi MU–300 Service Bulletin No. 30–007 also references the following documents as the additional sources of service information for accomplishment of certain other procedures:

- 1. Airplane Flight Manual Supplement M300–1003, dated December 6, 1995, which revises the Introduction, Operating Limitations, Emergency Procedures, Abnormal Procedures, Normal Procedures, Performance, and Weight and Balance Sections of the AFM to address the operation of the ice detector system.
- 2. Diamond I Flight Manual, Revision 29, dated January 5, 1996, which revises the