(A) Leak test the toilet tank anti-siphon (check) valve or the vacuum breaker check valve by filling the toilet tank with water/rinsing fluid to a level such that the bowl is approximately half full (at least 2 inches above the flapper in the bowl). Apply 3 PSID across the valve in the same direction as occurs in flight. The vent line vacuum breaker on vacuum breaker check valves must be pinched closed or plugged for this leak test. If there is a cap/valve at the flush/fill line port, the cap/valve must be removed/open during the test. Check for leakage at the flush/fill line port for a period of 5 minutes.

(B) Verify proper operation of the vent line vacuum breaker by filling the tank and checking at the fill line port for back drainage after disconnecting the fluid source from the flush/fill line port. If back drainage does not occur, replace the vent line vacuum breaker or repair the vacuum breaker check valve, in accordance with the component maintenance manual to obtain proper back drainage. As an alternative to the test technique specified above, verify proper operation of the vent line vacuum breaker in accordance with the procedures of the applicable component maintenance manual.

(iii) If a flush/fill ball valve, Kaiser Electroprecision p/n series 0062–0009, is installed on the flush/fill line of the subject lavatory, replace the seals in the flush/fill ball valve and the toilet tank anti-siphon valve. Perform a leak test of the toilet tank anti-siphon valve with a minimum of 3 PSID across the valve, in accordance with paragraph (a)(8)(ii)(A) of this AD.

(9) If leakage is discovered during any leak test or inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, or if evidence of leakage is found at any other time, accomplish the requirements of paragraph (a)(9)(i), (a)(9)(ii), or (a)(9)(iii) of this AD, as applicable.

(i) If a leak is discovered, prior to further flight, repair the leak. Prior to further flight after repair, perform the appropriate leak test as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, as applicable. Additionally, prior to returning the airplane to service, clean the surfaces adjacent to where the leakage occurred to clear them of any horizontal fluid residue streaks; such cleaning must be to the extent that any future appearance of a horizontal fluid residue streak will be taken to mean that the system is leaking again.

Note 3: For purposes of this AD, ''leakage'' is defined as any visible leakage, if observed during a leak test. At any other time (than during a leak test), ''leakage'' is defined as the presence of ice in the service panel, or horizontal fluid residue streaks/ice trails originating at the service panel. The fluid residue is usually, but not necessarily, blue in color.

(ii) If any worn or damaged seal is found, or if any damaged seal mating surface is found, prior to further flight, repair or replace it in accordance with the valve manufacturer's maintenance manual.

(iii) In lieu of performing the requirements of paragraph (a)(9)(i) or (a)(9)(ii): Prior to further flight, drain the affected lavatory system and placard the lavatory inoperative until repairs can be accomplished.

(b) For all airplanes: Unless accomplished previously, within 5,000 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, perform the actions specified in either paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD:

(1) Install an FAA-approved lever lock cap on the flush/fill lines for all lavatories. Or

(2) Install a vacuum break, Monogram p/n series 3765–190, or Shaw Aero Devices p/n series 301–0009–01, in the flush/fill lines for all lavatories. Or

(3) Install a flush/fill ball valve, Kaiser Electroprecision p/n series 0062–0009 on the flush/fill lines for all lavatories.

(c) For any affected airplane acquired after the effective date of this AD: Before any operator places into service any airplane subject to the requirements of this AD, a schedule for the accomplishment of the leak tests required by this AD shall be established in accordance with either paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD, as applicable. After each leak test has been performed once, each subsequent leak test must be performed in accordance with the new operator's schedule, in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD.

(1) For airplanes that have been maintained previously in accordance with this AD, the first leak test to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished in accordance with the previous operator's schedule or with the new operator's schedule, whichever results in the earlier accomplishment date for that leak test.

(2) For airplanes that have not been previously maintained in accordance with this AD, the first leak test to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished prior to further flight, or in accordance with a schedule approved by the FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector (PMI), but within a period not to exceed 200 flight hours.

(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 PMI, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 4: 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 July 1, 1998.

S.R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–18158 Filed 7–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–01–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A320–111, –211, –212, and –231 series airplanes, that currently requires reinforcement of the tail section of the fuselage at frames 68 and 69. That AD was prompted by reports indicating that the tail section has struck the runway during takeoffs and landings. This action would add a requirement for reinforcement of the tail section of the fuselage at frames 65 to 67. This action also would revise the applicability of the existing AD. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent structural damage to the tail section when it strikes the runway, which could result in depressurization of the fuselage during flight.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 10, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–01–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: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 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 98–NM–01–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–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–01–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

On April 2, 1997, the FAA issued AD 97–08–04, amendment 39–9992 (62 FR 17532, April 10, 1997), applicable to certain Airbus Model A320–111, –211, –212, and –231 airplanes, to require reinforcement of the tail section of the fuselage at frames 68 and 69. That action was prompted by reports indicating that the tail section has struck the runway during takeoffs and landings. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent structural damage to the tail section when it strikes the runway; that condition, if not detected, could result in depressurization of the fuselage during flight.

Actions Since Issuance of Previous AD

In the preamble to AD 97–08–04, the FAA specified that it may consider additional rulemaking to require modification of other affected fuselage frames once new service information was released by the manufacturer. The manufacturer has now released such information, and the FAA has determined that further rulemaking is indeed necessary; this proposed AD follows from that determination.

Explanation of New Service Information

The manufacturer has issued Airbus Service Bulletin A320–53–1131, dated July 24, 1997, which describes procedures for modification of the tail section of the airplane by reinforcing the fuselage structure at frames 65 to 67. The modification involves strengthening the fuselage structure at frames C65, C66, and C67 by installing new lower frames. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

The manufacturer also has issued Revision 1 of Airbus Service Bulletin A320–53–1110, dated November 27, 1995. The original issue of the service bulletin was referenced in the existing AD as an appropriate source of service information for modification of the tail section of the airplane at frames 68 and 69. Revision 1 is essentially identical to the original issue of the service bulletin; however, it revises references to certain part numbers.

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, classified these service bulletins as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 97–315–109(B), dated October 22, 1997, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

FAA's Conclusions

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.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would supersede AD 97–08–04 to continue to require reinforcement of the tail section of the fuselage at frames 68 and 69. The proposed AD would add a requirement for reinforcement of the tail section of the fuselage at frames 65 to 67. This action also would revise the applicability of the existing AD. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 118 airplanes of U.S. registry that would be affected by this proposed AD.

The actions that are currently required by AD 97–08–04, and retained in this proposed AD, take approximately 196 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts will be provided by the manufacturer at no cost to the operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the currently required actions on U.S. operators is estimated to be $1,387,680, or $11,760 per airplane.

The new actions that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 488 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would be provided by the manufacturer at no cost to the operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $3,455,040, or $29,280 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 39–9992 (62 FR 17532, April 10, 1997), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 98–NM–01–AD. Supersedes AD 97–08–04, Amendment 39–9992.

Applicability: Model A320 series airplanes on which Airbus Modification 22764 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 (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 structural damage to the tail section when it strikes the runway, which could result in depressurization of the fuselage during flight, accomplish the following:

Restatement of Requirement of AD 97–08–04

(a) For airplanes listed in Airbus Service Bulletin A320–53–1110, dated August 28, 1995: Within 6 years after May 15, 1997 (the effective date of AD 97–08–04, amendment 39–9992), modify the fuselage by reinforcing frames 68 and 69 in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–53–1110, dated August 28, 1995; or Revision 1, dated November 27, 1995.

New Requirements of this AD

(b) For airplanes other than those identified in paragraph (a) of this AD: Within 5 years after the effective date of this AD, modify the fuselage by reinforcing frames 68 and 69 in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–53–1110, dated August 28, 1995, or Revision 1, dated November 27, 1995.

(c) For all airplanes: Within 5 years after the effective date of this AD, modify the fuselage by reinforcing frames 65 to 67 in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–53–1131, dated July 24, 1997.

(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, International Branch, ANM–116, 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, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

(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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 97–315–109(B), dated October 22, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 1, 1998.

Stewart R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–18157 Filed 7–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–92–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Model YS–11 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 Mitsubishi Model YS–11 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive inspections to detect fatigue cracking in the manhole doublers of the lower wing panels; and repair, if necessary. This proposal also would require eventual modification of screw holes in the manhole doublers of the lower wing panels. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct fatigue cracking in the manhole doublers of the lower wing panels, which could result in failure of the wing structure.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 10, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–NM–92–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 Nihon Aeroplane Manufacturing, Toranomon Daiichi, Kotohire-Cho, Shiba, Minato-Ku, Tokyo, Japan. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Roberts, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712–4137; telephone (562) 627–5228; 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 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