

greater susceptibility to adverse effects from HIRF; and laboratory tests, in general, do not accurately represent the aircraft installation. Service experience alone will not be acceptable since such experience in normal flight operations may not include an exposure to HIRF. Reliance on a system with similar design features for redundancy, as a means of protection against the effects of external HIRF, is generally insufficient because all elements of a redundant system are likely to be concurrently exposed to the radiated fields.

The modulation that represents the signal most likely to disrupt the operation of the system under test, based on its design characteristics, should be selected. For example, flight control systems may be susceptible to 3 Hz square wave modulation while the video signals for electronic display systems may be susceptible to 400 Hz sinusoidal modulation. If the worst-case modulation is unknown or cannot be determined, default modulations may be used. Suggested default values are a 1 KHz sine wave with 80 percent depth of modulation in the frequency range from 10 KHz to 500 MHz and 1 KHz square wave with greater than 90 percent depth of modulation from MHz to 18 GHz. For frequencies where the unmodulated signal would cause deviations from normal operation, several different modulating signals with various waveforms and frequencies should be applied.

Acceptable system performance would be attained by demonstrating that the critical function components of the system under consideration continue to perform their intended function during and after exposure to required electromagnetic fields. Deviations from system specifications may be acceptable but must be independently assessed by the FAA on a case-by-case basis.

TABLE 1.—FIELD STRENGTH VOLTS/  
METER

Frequency	Peak	Average
10–100 KHz	50	50
100–500	60	60
500–2000	70	70
2–30 MHz	200	200
30–100	30	30
100–200	150	33
200–400	70	70
400–700	4020	935
700–1000	1700	170
1–2 GHz	5000	990
2–4	6680	840
4–6	6850	310
6–8	3600	670
8–12	3500	1270
12–18	3500	360

TABLE 1.—FIELD STRENGTH VOLTS/  
METER—Continued

Frequency	Peak	Average
18–40	2100	750

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable initially to the Sikorsky Model S76C helicopter. Should Sikorsky apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would apply to that model as well, under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

#### Conclusion

This action affects only certain unusual or novel design features on one model of helicopter. It is not a rule of general applicability and affects only the manufacturer who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on the affected helicopters.

#### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Parts 21 and 29

Aircraft, Air transportation, Aviation safety, Rotorcraft, Safety.

The authority citation for this special condition is as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7572; 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40105, 40113, 44701, 44702, 44704, 44709, 44711, 44713, 44715, 45303.

#### The Proposed Special Condition

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes the following special condition as a part of the type certification basis for the Sikorsky Model S76C helicopter.

#### *Protection for Electrical and Electronic Systems From High Intensity Radiated Fields*

Each system that performs critical functions must be designed and installed to ensure that the operation and operational capabilities of these critical functions are not adversely affected when the helicopters are exposed to high intensity radiated fields external to the helicopters.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on April 26, 1996.

Larry M. Kelly,

*Acting Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate,  
Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 96–11496 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

## Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–241–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

### Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 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 Airbus Model A310 series airplanes. This proposal would require 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. The proposal also would require replacement of all slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies with improved assemblies, which would terminate the repetitive inspections. This proposal 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 the proposed 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:** Comments must be received by June 17, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–241–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:** 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:

##### 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 95-NM-241-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. 95-NM-241-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

##### Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Airbus Model A310 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that it has received reports that, during maintenance inspections, the inner races were found to be broken or missing on the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies of the slat transmission system. The existing design can cause these inner races to be susceptible to cracking. If the inner race cracks, it could break off, and the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies consequently could become worn. This condition, if not corrected,

could result in failure of the shaft of the slat transmission system, and subsequent uncommanded movement of the associated slat.

##### Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A310-27-2040, Revision 2, dated January 5, 1995. The service bulletin describes procedures for repetitive visual inspections to detect discrepancies of the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies, and replacement of any discrepancy assembly with a new, like assembly.

The DGAC classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive (CN) 95-074-179(B), dated April 26, 1995, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

In addition, Lucas Liebherr has issued Service Bulletin 523-27-M523-1, dated April 25, 1986, which describes procedures for replacement of all slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies with new improved assemblies. Accomplishment of the replacement will eliminate the need for the repetitive inspections. The replacement will improve the reliability of the universal joint assemblies.

##### 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 the Proposed Requirements of the Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would require repetitive visual inspections to detect discrepancies of the slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies, and replacement of any discrepancy assembly with a new, like assembly. The proposed AD also would require replacement of all slat universal joint and steady bearing assemblies with new assemblies, which would constitute terminating action for the repetitive

inspection requirements. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

##### Differences Between the Proposal and the Related French AD

This proposed rule would differ from the parallel French airworthiness directive (CN) 95-074-179(B), in that it would mandate the accomplishment of the terminating action for the repetitive inspections. The French airworthiness directive provides that action as optional.

Mandating the terminating action is based on the FAA's determination that long term continued operational safety will be better assured by 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 continual inspections, has led the FAA to consider placing less emphasis on inspections and more emphasis on design improvements. The proposed requirement to accomplish the terminating action is in consonance with these considerations.

##### Cost Impact

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

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

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

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 USC 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

#### **§ 39.13 [Amended]**

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Airbus Industrie: 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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 2, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 96–11441 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–U**

### **14 CFR Part 39**

**[Docket No. 96–NM–90–AD]**

**RIN 2120–AA64**

### **Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G–1159 (G–II), G–1159A (G–III), and G–1159B (G–IIB) 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 Gulfstream Model G–1159 (G–II), G–1159A (G–III), and G–1159B (G–IIB) series airplanes. This proposal would require inspections to detect cracking and/or corrosion at various locations of the wings, and modification of cracked and/or corroded parts. This proposal is prompted by a report indicating that cracks, caused by stress corrosion, were found at various locations at buttock line (BL) 0 to BL 19 of the lower wing plank. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such stress corrosion cracking, which could result in structural failure of the wing under certain load conditions.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by June 17, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–90–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 Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Technical Operations Department, P.O. Box 2206, M/S D–10, Savannah, Georgia 31402–2206. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2–160, College Park, Georgia.