Task Assignment

[Federal Register: September 18, 1998 (Volume 63, Number 181)]
[Notices]
[Page 49944-49945]
From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]
[DOCID:fr18se98-108]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Transport Airplane and Engine Issues--New Task

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (**FAA**), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of new task assignment for the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC).

SUMMARY: Notice is given of a new task assigned to and accepted by the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC). This notice informs the public of the activities of ARAC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Stewart R. Miller, Transport Standards Staff (ANM-110), Federal Aviation Administration, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98055-4056; phone (415) 227-1255; fax (415) 227-1320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The **FAA** has established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to provide advice and recommendations to the **FAA** Administrator, through the Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification, on the full range of the **FAA**'s rulemaking activities with respect to aviation-related issues. This includes obtaining advice and recommendations on the **FAA**'s commitment to harmonize its Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) and practices with its trading partners in Europe and Canada.

One area ARAC deals with is Transport Airplane and Engine Issues. These issues involve the airworthiness standards for transport category airplanes and engines in 14 CFR parts 25, 33, and 35 and parallel provisions in 14 CFR parts 121 and 135.

The Task

This notice is to inform the public that the **FAA** has asked ARAC to provide advice and recommendation on the following harmonization task

Task 3: Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards; Flight Rules

The following differences between Part 25 and JAR 25 and their associated guidance material have been identified as having a potentially significant impact on airplane design:

1. Section 25.107(e)(1)(iv) requires a greater margin between V<INF>LOF</INF> and V<INF>MU</INF> than JAR 25.107(e)(1)(iv) for airplanes where liftoff attitude is limited either by geometry or elevator power. The **FAA** permits a reduction in the margin for

[[Page 49945]]

the geometry-limited case with all-engines-operating via a finding of equivalent safety, as noted in Advisory Circular 25-7A, but does not permit a reduction in the margin for the engine-inoperative case.

2. JAR 25.147(c) includes an additional requirement regarding roll rate with one-engine inoperative relative to Sec. 25.147(c).

3. JAR 25.253(a)(3) contains in additional requirement relative to Sec. 25.253(a)(3); namely, that adequate roll capability must be available to assure a prompt recovery from a lateral upset condition.

4. JAR 25.253(a) (5), which has no Part 25 equivalent, specifies that extension of airbrakes at speeds above the maximum operating speed/Mach number (V<INF>MO</INF>/M<INF>MO</INF>) must not result in an excessive positive load factor with the stick free and any nose-down pitching moment must be small.

For each of the above four issues the working group is to review airworthiness, safety, cost, and other relevant factors related to the specified differences, and reach consensus on harmonized Part 25/JAR 25 regulations and guidance material.

The **FAA** expects ARAC to submit its recommendation by December 31, 2000.

The **FAA** requests that ARAC draft appropriate regulatory documents with supporting economic and other required analyses, and any other related guidance material or collateral documents to support its recommendations. If the resulting recommendations(s) are one or more notices of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published by the **FAA**, the **FAA** may ask ARAC to recommend disposition of any substantive comments the **FAA** receives.

Working Group Activity

The Flight Test Harmonization Working Group is expected to comply with the procedures adopted by ARAC. As part of the procedures, the working group is expected to:

1. Recommend a work plan for completion of the tasks, including the rationale supporting such a plan, for consideration at the meeting of ARAC to consider transport airplane and engine issues held following publication of this notice.

2. Give a detailed conceptual presentation of the proposed recommendations, prior to proceeding with the work stated in item 3 below.

3. Draft appropriate regulatory documents with supporting economic and other required analyses, and/or any other related guidance material or collateral documents the working group determines to be appropriate; or, if new or revised requirements or compliance methods are not recommended, a draft report stating the rationale for not making such recommendations. If the resulting recommendation is one or more notices of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published by the **FAA**, the **FAA** may ask ARAC to recommend disposition of any substantive comments the **FAA** receives.

4. Provide a status report at each meeting of ARAC held to consider

transport airplane and engine issues.

The Secretary of Transportation has determined that the formation and use of ARAC are necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the **FAA** by law.

Meetings of ARAC will be open to the public. Meetings of the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group will not be open to the public, except to the extent that individuals with an interest and expertise are selected to participate. No public announcement of working group meetings will be made.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 14, 1998.

Joseph A. Hawkins,
Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 98-25069 Filed 9-17-98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Recommendation

400 Main Street
East Hartford, Connecticut 06108

Pratt & Whitney
A United Technologies Company

April 4, 2000

Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20591

Attention: Mr. Thomas McSweeny, Association Administrator for Regulation and Certification

Subject: ARAC Recommendations

Reference: ARAC Tasking, Federal Register, November 19, 1999

Dear Tom,

The Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group is pleased to submit the following "Fast Track" reports as recommendation to the FAA in accordance with the reference tasking. These reports have been prepared by the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group.

Task 3
- 25.1419 (Ice Protection) ANM-94-464-A

7
- 25.1501(c), 25.1583(k), 25X1591 ANM-00-079-A

4
- 25.107(e) (l) (iv) — ANM-98-464-A

Sincerely yours,

Craig R. Bolt

Craig R. Bolt
Assistance Chair, TAEIG

Attachments

Copy: Kris Carpenter - FAA-NWR
*Bob Park - Boeing
*Effie Upshaw - FAA Washington, DC

*letter only

crb05_040400

ANM-98-464-A

RPR # ______________

ARAC WG Report

Report from the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group

Rule Section: FAR/JAR 25.107(e)(1)(iv)

What is the underlying safety issue addressed by the FAR/JAR?: This requirement ensures that the scheduled takeoff speeds provide a minimum liftoff speed (V_{LOF}) greater than the minimum safe flyaway speed (V_{MU}). V_{MU} is the speed at which it is demonstrated that no hazardous characteristics are present, such as a relatively high drag condition or a stall. A minimum speed margin between V_{LOF} and V_{MU} is prescribed by this rule to ensure a safe takeoff speed, considering likely in-service variations in speed during the takeoff maneuver.

What are the current FAR and JAR standards?: see below

FAR/JAR 25.107(e)(1) V_R may not be less than –

Current FAR text: A speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than 110% of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and not less than 105% of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

Current JAR text: A speed that, if the aeroplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than 110% of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and not less than 105% of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition, except that in the particular case that lift-off is limited by the geometry of the aeroplane, or by elevator power, the above margins may be reduced to 108% in the all-engines-operating case and 104% in the one-engine-inoperative condition. (See ACJ 25.107(e)(1)(iv).)

What are the differences in the standards and what do these differences result in?: The JAR allows a reduction in the speed margins between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} for airplanes for which the minimum liftoff speed is limited by the geometry of the airplane (i.e., ground contact with the runway) or by elevator power (i.e., the liftoff pitch attitude is limited by the capability of the elevator to generate an aerodynamic force to pitch the airplane). The JAA consider these limiting conditions to provide protection against early or over-rotation beyond the safe liftoff pitch attitude at or near V_{MU} such that the prescribed minimum speed margin can be reduced without reducing the level of safety.

The takeoff speeds provided to the pilot consist of the takeoff rotation speed (V_R) and the takeoff safety speed (V_2). V_R is the speed used by the pilot to begin raising the nosewheel off the runway during the acceleration to V_2. In general, the lower the V_R speed, the shorter the takeoff distance. The minimum value of V_R is limited by the requirements of

§ 25.107(e). In accordance with § 25.107(e), V_R must be not be less than: (a) V_1, (b) 1.05 times the minimum control speed (V_{MC}), (c) a speed that allows reaching V_2 before reaching 35 feet above the takeoff surface, or (d) a speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} that provides the prescribed minimum speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}.

In cases where the minimum value of V_R is limited by the speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}, allowing a reduction in this speed margin would result in shorter required takeoff distances. For a given runway length, the reduced speed margins would permit a higher takeoff weight.

Although the FAR does not contain the provisions regarding reduced speed margins for geometry or elevator power limited airplanes, a reduction in the speed margin for the all-engines-operating condition for geometry-limited airplanes has been granted on more than one occasion on the basis of equivalent safety. The resulting speed margin that has been applied is the same as that specified in the JAR for this condition – 108%.

This difference between the FAR and JAR standards only affects airplanes that have: (1) V_R speeds that are determined by the speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}, and (2) V_{MU} speeds that are limited by takeoff pitch attitude either due to airplane geometry or elevator power. Airplanes that have been FAA type-certificated to the reduced V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for the all-engines-operating condition include the Boeing 727, some models of the Boeing 707, and all Airbus models. For JAA certification only, the Airbus A330 and A340 airplanes were also certificated to the reduced one-engine-inoperative speed margin.

Other airplane types may have qualified for the reduced speed margins, but in each case the applicants chose not to pursue that option. In most such cases, the one-engine-inoperative condition was the limiting condition and the availability of a reduced all-engines-operating V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for FAA certification would not have resulted in any change to the minimum required takeoff speeds. In these cases, the applicants also chose to retain the same takeoff speeds for FAA and JAA certification, in spite of the availability of a reduced speed margin for the one-engine-inoperative condition under the JAR. In other cases, the minimum required takeoff speeds were determined by one of the criteria other than the minimum required speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}, and therefore, a reduced speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} would not have affected the minimum required takeoff speeds.

<u>What, if any, are the differences in the means of compliance?</u>: The differences in the means of compliance only reflect the differences in the standards. These differences are addressed through analysis because the prescribed speed margins are applied analytically. Normally, there would not be any additional flight testing involved, nor are there design or construction differences. The rotation speeds and associated takeoff distance data provided in the Airplane Flight Manual would be different for affected airplanes.

What is the proposed action?: The proposed action is to harmonize the two standards by allowing a reduction in the all-engines-operating and one-engine-inoperative speed margins for geometry-limited airplanes as in the current JAR, but not to allow such an alleviation for elevator power-limited airplanes, which the JAR also allows. The geometry-limited airplane is physically limited from reaching a takeoff pitch attitude while on the runway beyond that which has shown to be safe. Because the minimum required speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} is partly there to reduce the probability for an airplane to reach a takeoff pitch attitude beyond that which has shown to be safe, it would be appropriate to allow this minimum speed margin to be reduced for a geometry-limited airplane.

After the airplane is airborne and is no longer in close proximity to the ground, the geometry-limited airplane has no more protection against reaching an unsafe pitch attitude than a non-geometry-limited airplane. However, the geometry-limited airplane may actually have a larger safety margin than that implied by the proposed speed margin. If the airplane were not geometry-limited, the airplane may have been capable of reaching higher pitch attitudes and lower V_{MU} speeds.

An airplane for which the takeoff pitch attitude is limited by elevator power, however, does not have the same degree of protection from reaching a pitch attitude beyond that which has been shown to be safe. This protection from early or over-rotation may not exist for more aft loading conditions, mistrim conditions, or at speeds above V_{MU}. Therefore, the reduction in minimum speed margins between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} will not be permitted for elevator power-limited airplanes.

In addition, harmonized advisory material is proposed that would provide information on an acceptable means of showing compliance to the proposed standard. While this proposed advisory material is similar to the current guidance provided in AC 25-7A, some changes are being proposed. The most significant proposed change is the deletion of the need for safeguards protecting the geometry limited airplane against overrotation on the ground and in the air. Simply by virtue of being geometry limited, the airplane is safeguarded from overrotation on the ground and shortly after liftoff. Once the airplane is no longer in close proximity to the ground, it is not entirely clear what would constitute an "overrotation." The existing requirements require adequate stall warning to be provided, so that overrotation to the point of stall is already safeguarded.

Another proposed change to the AC 25-7A advisory material is to delete the need for the airplane's pitch attitude to be within 5 percent (in degrees) of the tail dragging attitude during the speed range between 96 and 100 percent of the actual liftoff speed. The intent of this criterion is to ensure that the airplane is actually geometry-limited, and that no unique flight test techniques are being used to attain the geometry-limited condition. Although the intent is a good one, strict compliance with the 5 percent allowed variation in pitch attitude is very difficult to achieve. Instead, the FTHWG considers this intent to be addressed by proposed changes to the criterion that the aft under-surface of the airplane achieves contact with the runway during the speed range between 96 and 100 percent of the actual liftoff speed. The FTHWG proposes that this criterion state that the airplane's aft under-surface should be in contact with the runway during this speed range, not just that runway contact must be made at some point in the speed range. Additional words would be added to clarify that due to the dynamic nature of the test, however, it is recognized that runway contact will probably not be maintained during this entire speed range, and that some judgment is necessary as to whether the airplane is geometry-limited.

Lastly, the proposed advisory material clarifies that the condition at which the compliance criteria are evaluated should be the lowest thrust-to-weight ratio for the all-engines-operating condition. This condition is expected to be the most critical condition for demonstrating a safe flyaway capability.

The FTHWG considered whether the proposed standard could potentially result in a higher incidence of tail contact with the runway (i.e., tailstrikes) during normal operations. After a review of a representative set of data, the FTHWG concluded that: (1) no evidence exists to show that the proposed V_R reduction for geometry-limited airplanes (currently permitted by the JAR) has led to more tailstrikes or resulted in any other safety problem; (2) a small variation in V_R (such as that which would result from application of the proposed standard) is not a major contributor to tailstrikes; and (3) 60-75% of tailstrikes occur on landing.

What should the harmonized standard be?: see below

Proposed text of harmonized standard:

FAR/JAR 25.107(e)(1)(iv) A speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than –

(A) 110 percent of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition, and 105 percent of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition; or

(B) If V_{MU} is limited by the geometry of the airplane (i.e., tail contact with the runway), 108 percent of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and 104 percent of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

How does this proposed standard address the underlying safety issue?: The proposed standard continues to address the underlying safety issue in the same manner, but allows the prescribed minimum speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} to be reduced if the V_{MU} speed is limited by the geometry of the airplane. In this case, the geometry of the airplane helps to prevent reaching a potentially hazardous pitch attitude at, or shortly after takeoff.

Relative to the current FAR, does the proposed standard increase, decrease, or maintain the same level of safety?: Although the proposed standard would allow a reduction in the V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for certain airplanes, it would maintain the same level of safety relative to that intended by the current standards. The reduced speed margin would apply only to airplanes for which V_{MU} is limited by airplane geometry, such that a hard physical limit (fuselage contact with the runway) protects the airplane from reaching a potentially hazardous takeoff pitch attitude while still on the ground. Since the minimum required speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} is, in part, intended to reduce the probability for an airplane to reach a takeoff pitch attitude beyond that which has shown to be safe, the additional protection against such a condition inherent to a geometry-limited airplane would allow the V_{MU} and V_{LOF} speed margin to be reduced while providing the same level of safety. Currently, the FAA allows, by equivalent safety finding, a reduction in the V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for the all-engines-operating condition. The proposed standard would codify this practice and extend its application to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

Relative to current industry practice, does the proposed standard increase, decrease, or maintain the same level of safety?: Current industry practice varies. However, the proposed standard would not allow the level of safety to be reduced below that already practiced within the industry as a whole.

What other options have been considered and why were they not selected?: Other options that were considered were to retain either the existing FAR standard or the existing JAR standard. Retaining the existing FAR standard would provide a more stringent requirement, but it is anticipated that this would simply lead to more requests for equivalent safety findings and result in compliance with something close to the proposed standard.

Harmonizing on the JAR standard would not retain the existing level of safety for airplanes that are limited by elevator power. A lack of elevator power would not provide an equivalent level of protection against over-rotation as a geometry limit. In the elevator power limited case, in-service errors in determining the airplane center-of-gravity location or elevator trim position could override the elevator power limit.

Who would be affected by the proposed change?: Manufacturers and operators of transport category airplanes would be affected by the rule change. Operators could be affected to the extent that takeoff speeds, and hence, allowable takeoff weights could be affected by the proposed change. Because the proposed change is alleviating, operators may realize an economic benefit.

To ensure harmonization, what current advisory material (e.g., ACJ, AMJ, AC, policy letters) needs to be included in the rule text or preamble?: It should be stated in the preamble that an airplane that is deemed to be geometry-limited at the test conditions referenced in AC 25-7A is expected to be geometry-limited over its entire takeoff operating envelope. If not, the airplane is not considered geometry-limited and the reduced V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margins do not apply.

Is existing FAA advisory material adequate? (If not, what advisory material should be adopted?): The existing advisory material needs to be harmonized and revised to reflect the proposed harmonized standard.

Proposed advisory material: (AC 25-7A)

(viii) V_{MU} Testing for Geometry Limited Airplanes.

(A) For airplanes that are geometry limited (i.e., the minimum possible V_{MU} speeds are limited by tail contact with the runway), § 25.107(e)(1)(iv)(B) allows the V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margins to be reduced to 108 percent and 104 percent for the all-engines-operating and one-engine-inoperative conditions, respectively. The V_{MU} demonstrated must be sound and repeatable.

(B) One acceptable means for demonstrating compliance with §§ 25.107(d) and 25.107(e)(1)(iv) with respect to the capability for a safe liftoff and fly-away from the geometry limited condition is to show that at the lowest thrust-to-weight ratio for the all-engines-operating condition:

(1) During the speed range from 96 to 100 percent of the actual liftoff speed, the aft under-surface of the airplane should be in contact with the runway. Because of the dynamic nature of the test, it is recognized that contact will probably not be maintained during this entire speed range, and some judgment is necessary. It has been found acceptable for contact to exist approximately 50 percent of the time that the airplane is in this speed range.

(2) Beyond the point of liftoff to a height of 35 ft., the airplane's pitch attitude should not decrease below that at the point of liftoff, nor should the speed increase more than 10 percent.

(3) The horizontal distance from the start of the takeoff to a height of 35 feet should not be greater than 105 percent of the distance determined in accordance with § 25.113(a)(2) without the 115 percent factor.

How does the proposed standard compare to the current ICAO standards?: The ICAO standards do not contain specific requirements in this area.

Does the proposed standard affect other harmonization working groups?: No.

What is the cost impact of complying with the proposed standard?: The proposed standard would be cost beneficial in that there is a potential for a small increase in payload for geometry-limited airplanes than is currently available under the FAR with no change to the cost of certification. The proposed standard would have no effect on the cost of certifying or operating airplanes that are not deemed geometry-limited.

RPR # _______________

<u>Does the working group want to review the draft NPRM prior to publication in the Federal Register?</u>: Yes

<u>In light of the information provided in this report, does the HWG consider that the "Fast Track" process is appropriate for this rulemaking project, or is the project too complex or controversial for the Fast Track Process. Explain</u>: Yes, the "Fast Track" process is appropriate for this project. The project is neither too complex nor too controversial to use the "Fast Track" process.

#7

ARAC WG Report

Report from the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group

Rule Sections: FAR/JAR 25.1501(c), 25.1583(k), 25X1591

Note: This working group report addresses all three rule sections noted above because these rule sections all address the same general issue, and the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group recommendation is the same for all three rule sections.

1 - What is underlying safety issue to be addressed by the FAR/JAR? [Explain the underlying safety rationale for the requirement. Why should the requirement exist? What prompted this rulemaking activity (e.g., new technology, service history, etc.)?] The underlying safety issue for these rule sections is the safety of takeoff and landing operations on runways contaminated by standing water, slush, snow, or ice. These runway contaminants can significantly impair the ability of the airplane to accelerate to takeoff speed or come to a stop after a rejected takeoff or landing. The current FAR part 25 requirements only address dry and wet runways. There are no specific part 25 requirements pertaining to contaminated runways. It should be noted that nearly 10 percent of rejected takeoff accidents have occurred on runways that were reported as contaminated. (The runway conditions were not reported for about 28 percent of the rejected takeoff accidents.)

The general requirement of §/JAR 25.1501 is intended to ensure that operating limitations and other information necessary for safe operation of the airplane are established and made available to the flight crew. The JAR contains an additional requirement, JAR 25.1501(c), that supplementary information must be made available to the operator as prescribed in JAR 25X1591.

JAR 25.1583(k), which is not contained in the FAR, requires applicants to furnish, in the Airplane Flight Manual, an airplane operating limitation on the maximum depth of runway contaminants allowed for takeoff. Significant depths of contaminant may result in airplane damage from the impingement of contaminant spray with the airplane structure and exposed systems, and the effects of contaminant drag may impair the ability of the airplane to safely complete a takeoff or rejected takeoff. The limitation required by JAR 25.1583(k) prohibits operations in contaminant depths that could lead to these hazards.

JAR 25X1591, which is not contained in the FAR, lists the supplementary performance information for takeoff and landing on contaminated runways that must be furnished by the airplane manufacturer. This information is intended to assist the operator in developing suitable guidance, recommendations, or instructions for their flightcrew when taking off or landing on contaminated runways. These performance data are also needed to comply with the JAR operating rules, JAR-OPS 1. JAR-OPS 1 requires operators of turbopropeller airplanes with a maximum approved passenger seating configuration of more than 9 or a maximum takeoff mass exceeding 5700 kg, and operators of all multiengine turbojet airplanes to use these data (or an equivalent set of data acceptable to the Authority) for determining the allowable takeoff and landing weight for contaminated runways.

(Note: JAR 25X1591 and the associated advisory material also refer to wet runways, but this reference will be removed with the adoption of Change 15 to JAR-25. Change 15 incorporates the JAR equivalent to FAR Amendment 25-92, which prescribes type certification standards for wet runway takeoff performance.)

2 - What are the current FAR and JAR standards relative to this subject? [Reproduce the FAR and JAR rules text as indicated below.]

25.1501(c)

Current FAR text: None

Current JAR text: (c) Supplementary information must be made available to the operator of each aeroplane as prescribed in JAR 25X1591.

25.1583(k)

Current FAR text: None

Current JAR text: (k) A limitation on the maximum depth of runway contaminants for take-off operation must be furnished. (See ACJ 25.1583(k).)

25X1591

Current FAR text: None

Current JAR text: **Supplementary performance information** (See AMJ 25X1591)

(a) Supplementary performance information must be furnished by the manufacturer in an approved document, in the form of guidance material, to assist operators in developing suitable guidance, recommendations or instructions for use by their flight crews when operating on wet and contaminated runway surface conditions.

(b) The approved document must clearly indicate the conditions use for establishing the wet/contaminated runway performance information. It must also state to the operator that actual conditions different from those used for establishing the wet/contaminated runway performance information, may lead to different performance.

(c) The following supplementary performance information must be furnished:

(1) *Take-off on wet runways.* Take-off performance information appropriate to a wet hard-surfaced runway must be established. If it appears in the aeroplane Flight Manual, this information must be segregated from the additional operating limitations of JAR 25.1533 and the performance information of JAR 25.1587.

(2) *Runways contaminated with standing water, slush, loose snow, compacted snow or ice.* Information on the effect of runway contaminants on the expected performance of the aeroplane during take-off and landing on hard-surfaced runways must be furnished. If it appears in the aeroplane Flight Manual, this information must be segregated, identified as guidance material and clearly distinguished from the additional operating limitations of JAR 25.1533 and the performance information of JAR 25.1587.

2a – If no FAR or JAR standard exists, what means have been used to ensure this safety issue is addressed? [Reproduce text from issue papers, special conditions, policy, certification action items, etc., that have been used relative to this issue] N/A

3 - What are the differences in the FAA and JAA standards or policy and what do these differences result in?: [Explain the differences in the standards or policy, and what these differences result in relative to (as applicable) design features/capability, safety margins, cost, stringency, etc.] The JAA have both airworthiness type certification and operating rules to address contaminated runway operations. The FAA has no specific regulatory requirements for contaminated runway operations, but has published an Advisory Circular (AC) on the subject. AC 91-6A, "Water, Slush, and Snow on the Runway". In this AC, the FAA provides background and guidelines for the operation of turbojet aircraft with water, slush, and/or snow on the runway.

In the JAR operating requirements, engine failure on takeoff must be taken into account in the same manner as for dry runways. The FAA AC guidance, which is not mandatory, contains examples for both the one-engine-inoperative case and the all-engines-operating (i.e., no engine failure) case. Though many U.S. air carriers operating practices are in line with the JAR-OPS standards, this practice is not universal. The JAR requirement, being mandatory, is more stringent. It provides greater safety margins for operations on contaminated runways and can result in higher costs due to potentially severe payload restrictions.

Copies of FAA AC 91-6A and JAA AMJ 25X1591 are attached. The relevant JAR ACJ's are reprinted below:

ACJ 25.1501

Operating Limitations and Information – General (Interpretative Material)

The limitations and information established in accordance with Subpart G should be only those which are within the competence of the flight crew to observe, and should relate only to those situations (including pre-and post-flight) with which a flight crew member might reasonably be concerned.

ACJ 25.1583(k)

Maximum Depth of Runway Contaminants for Take-off Operations (Acceptable Means of Compliance)

Compliance with JAR 25.1583(k) may be shown using either Method 1 or Method 2 –

a. *Method 1*. If information on the effect of runway contaminants on the expected take-off performance of the aeroplane is furnished in accordance with the provisions of JAR 25X1591(c)(2), take-off operation should be limited to the contamination depths for which take-off information is provided.

b. *Method 2*. If information on the effect of runway contaminants on the expected take-off performance of the aeroplane in accordance with the provisions of JAR 25X1591(c)(2) is not provided, take-off operation should be limited to runways where the degree of contamination does not exceed the equivalent of 3 mm (0.125 inch) of water, except in isolated areas not exceeding a total of 25% of the area within the required length and width being used.

Note 1. In establishing the maximum depth of runway contaminants it may be necessary to take account of the maximum depth for which the engine air intakes have been shown to be free of ingesting hazardous quantities of water or other contaminants in accordance with JAR 25.1091(d)(2).

Note 2. Unless performance effects are based on tests in water depths exceeding 15 mm, or on other evidence equivalent in accuracy to the results of direct testing, it will not normally be acceptable to approve take-off operating in depths of contaminants exceeding the equivalent of 15mm of water.

4 - What, if any, are the differences in the current means of compliance? [Provide a brief explanation of any differences in the current compliance criteria or methodology (e.g., issue papers), including any differences in either criteria, methodology, or application that result in a difference in stringency between the standards.] The differences in the means of compliance are due to the differences in the standards, and are identified in paragraphs 1 and 3 above.

5 – What is the proposed action? [Describe the new proposed requirement, or the proposed change to the existing requirement, as applicable. Is the proposed action to introduce a new standard, or to take some other action? Explain what action is being proposed (not the regulatory text, but the underlying rationale) and why that direction was chosen for each proposed action.] See paragraph 20 below.

For each proposed change from the existing standard, answer the following questions:

6 - What should the harmonized standard be? [Insert the proposed text of the harmonized standard here] N/A

7 - How does this proposed standard address the underlying safety issue (identified under #1)? [Explain how the proposed standard ensures that the underlying safety issue is taken care of.] N/A

8 - Relative to the current FAR, does the proposed standard increase, decrease, or maintain the same level of safety? Explain. [Explain how each element of the proposed change to the standards affects the level of safety relative to the current FAR. It is possible that some portions of the proposal may reduce the level of safety even though the proposal as a whole may increase the level of safety.] N/A

9 - Relative to current industry practice, does the proposed standard increase, decrease, or maintain the same level of safety? Explain. [Since industry practice may be different than what is required by the FAR (e.g., general industry practice may be more restrictive), explain how each element of the proposed change to the standards affects the level of safety relative to current industry practice. Explain whether current industry practice is in compliance with the proposed standard.] N/A

10 - What other options have been considered and why were they not selected?: [Explain what other options were considered, and why they were not selected (e.g., cost/benefit, unacceptable decrease in the level of safety, lack of consensus, etc.) Include the pros and cons associated with each alternative.] N/A

11 - Who would be affected by the proposed change? [Identify the parties that would be materially affected by the rule change – airplane manufacturers, airplane operators, etc.] N/A

12 - To ensure harmonization, what current advisory material (e.g., ACJ, AMJ, AC, policy letters) needs to be included in the rule text or preamble? [Does any existing advisory material include substantive requirements that should be contained in the regulation? This may occur because the regulation itself is vague, or if the advisory material is interpreted as providing the only acceptable means of compliance.] N/A

13 - Is existing FAA advisory material adequate? If not, what advisory material should be adopted? [Indicate whether the existing advisory material (if any) is adequate. If the current advisory material is not adequate, indicate whether the existing material should be revised, or new material provided. Also, either insert the text of the proposed advisory material here, or summarize the information it will contain, and indicate what form it will be in (e.g., Advisory Circular, policy, Order, etc.)] N/A

14 - How does the proposed standard compare to the current ICAO standard? [Indicate whether the proposed standard complies with or does not comply with the applicable ICAO standards (if any)] N/A

15 - Does the proposed standard affect other HWG's? [Indicate whether the proposed standard should be reviewed by other harmonization working groups and why.] N/A

16 - What is the cost impact of complying with the proposed standard [Please provide information that will assist in estimating the change in cost (either positive or negative) of the proposed rule. For example, if new tests or designs are required, what is known with respect to the testing or engineering costs? If new equipment is required, what can be reported relative to purchase, installation, and maintenance costs? In contrast, if the proposed rule relieves industry of testing or other costs, please provide any known estimate of costs.] N/A

17. - If advisory or interpretive material is to be submitted, document the advisory or interpretive guidelines. If disagreement exists, document the disagreement. N/A

18.- -Does the HWG wish to answer any supplementary questions specific to this project? [If the HWG can think of customized questions or concerns relevant to this project, please present the questions and the HWG answers and comments here.] N/A

19. – Does the HWG want to review the draft NPRM at "Phase 4" prior to publication in the Federal Register? N/A

20. – In light of the information provided in this report, does the HWG consider that the "Fast Track" process is appropriate for this rulemaking project, or is the project too complex or controversial for the Fast Track Process? Explain. [A negative answer to this question will prompt the FAA to pull the project out of the Fast Track process and forward the issues to the FAA's Rulemaking Management Council for consideration as a "significant" project.] Because of the status of a related rulemaking project for which another working group within the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee has been tasked with making recommendations, the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group (FTHWG) considers the "Fast Track" process to be inappropriate for this rulemaking project.

The issue of harmonizing air carrier operational requirements for operations on contaminated runways is currently tasked to the Airplane Performance Harmonization Working Group (APHWG) (reporting to the Air Carrier Operations Issues Group). The APHWG is tasked with delivering its recommendations to the FAA/JAA by the end of this year (2000).

Harmonization of the type certification airworthiness standards for operations on contaminated runways prior to completion of the operating rule harmonization project would be premature. Therefore, the FTHWG recommends that this project be deferred until the process of harmonizing the operating rules in this area is completed.

ARAC WG Report

Report from the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group

Rule Section: FAR/JAR 25.107(e)(1)(iv)

What is the underlying safety issue addressed by the FAR/JAR?: This requirement ensures that the scheduled takeoff speeds provide a minimum liftoff speed (V_{LOF}) greater than the minimum safe flyaway speed (V_{MU}). V_{MU} is the speed at which it is demonstrated that no hazardous characteristics are present, such as a relatively high drag condition or a stall. A minimum speed margin between V_{LOF} and V_{MU} is prescribed by this rule to ensure a safe takeoff speed, considering likely in-service variations in speed during the takeoff maneuver.

What are the current FAR and JAR standards?: see below

FAR/JAR 25.107(e)(1) V_R may not be less than –

Current FAR text: A speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than 110% of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and not less than 105% of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

Current JAR text: A speed that, if the aeroplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than 110% of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and not less than 105% of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition, except that in the particular case that lift-off is limited by the geometry of the aeroplane, or by elevator power, the above margins may be reduced to 108% in the all-engines-operating case and 104% in the one-engine-inoperative condition. (See ACJ 25.107(e)(1)(iv).)

What are the differences in the standards and what do these differences result in?: The JAR allows a reduction in the speed margins between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} for airplanes for which the minimum liftoff speed is limited by the geometry of the airplane (i.e., ground contact with the runway) or by elevator power (i.e., the liftoff pitch attitude is limited by the capability of the elevator to generate an aerodynamic force to pitch the airplane). The JAA consider these limiting conditions to provide protection against early or over-rotation beyond the safe liftoff pitch attitude at or near V_{MU} such that the prescribed minimum speed margin can be reduced without reducing the level of safety.

The takeoff speeds provided to the pilot consist of the takeoff rotation speed (V_R) and the takeoff safety speed (V_2). V_R is the speed used by the pilot to begin raising the nosewheel off the runway during the acceleration to V_2. In general, the lower the V_R speed, the shorter the takeoff distance. The minimum value of V_R is limited by the requirements of

§ 25.107(e). In accordance with § 25.107(e), V_R must be not be less than: (a) V_1, (b) 1.05 times the minimum control speed (V_{MC}), (c) a speed that allows reaching V_2 before reaching 35 feet above the takeoff surface, or (d) a speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} that provides the prescribed minimum speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}.

In cases where the minimum value of V_R is limited by the speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}, allowing a reduction in this speed margin would result in shorter required takeoff distances. For a given runway length, the reduced speed margins would permit a higher takeoff weight.

Although the FAR does not contain the provisions regarding reduced speed margins for geometry or elevator power limited airplanes, a reduction in the speed margin for the all-engines-operating condition for geometry-limited airplanes has been granted on more than one occasion on the basis of equivalent safety. The resulting speed margin that has been applied is the same as that specified in the JAR for this condition – 108%.

This difference between the FAR and JAR standards only affects airplanes that have: (1) V_R speeds that are determined by the speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}, and (2) V_{MU} speeds that are limited by takeoff pitch attitude either due to airplane geometry or elevator power. Airplanes that have been FAA type-certificated to the reduced V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for the all-engines-operating condition include the Boeing 727, some models of the Boeing 707, and all Airbus models. For JAA certification only, the Airbus A330 and A340 airplanes were also certificated to the reduced one-engine-inoperative speed margin.

Other airplane types may have qualified for the reduced speed margins, but in each case the applicants chose not to pursue that option. In most such cases, the one-engine-inoperative condition was the limiting condition and the availability of a reduced all-engines-operating V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for FAA certification would not have resulted in any change to the minimum required takeoff speeds. In these cases, the applicants also chose to retain the same takeoff speeds for FAA and JAA certification, in spite of the availability of a reduced speed margin for the one-engine-inoperative condition under the JAR. In other cases, the minimum required takeoff speeds were determined by one of the criteria other than the minimum required speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF}, and therefore, a reduced speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} would not have affected the minimum required takeoff speeds.

<u>What, if any, are the differences in the means of compliance?</u>: The differences in the means of compliance only reflect the differences in the standards. These differences are addressed through analysis because the prescribed speed margins are applied analytically. Normally, there would not be any additional flight testing involved, nor are there design or construction differences. The rotation speeds and associated takeoff distance data provided in the Airplane Flight Manual would be different for affected airplanes.

What is the proposed action?: The proposed action is to harmonize the two standards by allowing a reduction in the all-engines-operating and one-engine-inoperative speed margins for geometry-limited airplanes as in the current JAR, but not to allow such an alleviation for elevator power-limited airplanes, which the JAR also allows. The geometry-limited airplane is physically limited from reaching a takeoff pitch attitude while on the runway beyond that which has shown to be safe. Because the minimum required speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} is partly there to reduce the probability for an airplane to reach a takeoff pitch attitude beyond that which has shown to be safe, it would be appropriate to allow this minimum speed margin to be reduced for a geometry-limited airplane.

After the airplane is airborne and is no longer in close proximity to the ground, the geometry-limited airplane has no more protection against reaching an unsafe pitch attitude than a non-geometry-limited airplane. However, the geometry-limited airplane may actually have a larger safety margin than that implied by the proposed speed margin. If the airplane were not geometry-limited, the airplane may have been capable of reaching higher pitch attitudes and lower V_{MU} speeds.

An airplane for which the takeoff pitch attitude is limited by elevator power, however, does not have the same degree of protection from reaching a pitch attitude beyond that which has been shown to be safe. This protection from early or over-rotation may not exist for more aft loading conditions, mistrim conditions, or at speeds above V_{MU}. Therefore, the reduction in minimum speed margins between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} will not be permitted for elevator power-limited airplanes.

In addition, harmonized advisory material is proposed that would provide information on an acceptable means of showing compliance to the proposed standard. While this proposed advisory material is similar to the current guidance provided in AC 25-7A, some changes are being proposed. The most significant proposed change is the deletion of the need for safeguards protecting the geometry limited airplane against overrotation on the ground and in the air. Simply by virtue of being geometry limited, the airplane is safeguarded from overrotation on the ground and shortly after liftoff. Once the airplane is no longer in close proximity to the ground, it is not entirely clear what would constitute an "overrotation." The existing requirements require adequate stall warning to be provided, so that overrotation to the point of stall is already safeguarded.

Another proposed change to the AC 25-7A advisory material is to delete the need for the airplane's pitch attitude to be within 5 percent (in degrees) of the tail dragging attitude during the speed range between 96 and 100 percent of the actual liftoff speed. The intent of this criterion is to ensure that the airplane is actually geometry-limited, and that no unique flight test techniques are being used to attain the geometry-limited condition. Although the intent is a good one, strict compliance with the 5 percent allowed variation in pitch attitude is very difficult to achieve. Instead, the FTHWG considers this intent to be addressed by proposed changes to the criterion that the aft under-surface of the airplane achieves contact with the runway during the speed range between 96 and 100 percent of the actual liftoff speed. The FTHWG proposes that this criterion state that the airplane's aft under-surface should be in contact with the runway during this speed range, not just that runway contact must be made at some point in the speed range. Additional words would be added to clarify that due to the dynamic nature of the test, however, it is recognized that runway contact will probably not be maintained during this entire speed range, and that some judgment is necessary as to whether the airplane is geometry-limited.

Lastly, the proposed advisory material clarifies that the condition at which the compliance criteria are evaluated should be the lowest thrust-to-weight ratio for the all-engines-operating condition. This condition is expected to be the most critical condition for demonstrating a safe flyaway capability.

The FTHWG considered whether the proposed standard could potentially result in a higher incidence of tail contact with the runway (i.e., tailstrikes) during normal operations. After a review of a representative set of data, the FTHWG concluded that: (1) no evidence exists to show that the proposed V_R reduction for geometry-limited airplanes (currently permitted by the JAR) has led to more tailstrikes or resulted in any other safety problem; (2) a small variation in V_R (such as that which would result from application of the proposed standard) is not a major contributor to tailstrikes; and (3) 60-75% of tailstrikes occur on landing.

<u>What should the harmonized standard be?</u>: see below

<u>Proposed text of harmonized standard:</u>

<u>FAR/JAR 25.107(e)(1)(iv)</u> A speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than –

<u>(A)</u> 110 percent of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition, and 105 percent of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition; or

<u>(B)</u> If V_{MU} is limited by the geometry of the airplane (i.e., tail contact with the runway), 108 percent of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and 104 percent of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

<u>How does this proposed standard address the underlying safety issue?</u>: The proposed standard continues to address the underlying safety issue in the same manner, but allows the prescribed minimum speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} to be reduced if the V_{MU} speed is limited by the geometry of the airplane. In this case, the geometry of the airplane helps to prevent reaching a potentially hazardous pitch attitude at, or shortly after takeoff.

<u>Relative to the current FAR, does the proposed standard increase, decrease, or maintain the same level of safety?</u>: Although the proposed standard would allow a reduction in the V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for certain airplanes, it would maintain the same level of safety relative to that intended by the current standards. The reduced speed margin would apply

only to airplanes for which V_{MU} is limited by airplane geometry, such that a hard physical limit (fuselage contact with the runway) protects the airplane from reaching a potentially hazardous takeoff pitch attitude while still on the ground. Since the minimum required speed margin between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} is, in part, intended to reduce the probability for an airplane to reach a takeoff pitch attitude beyond that which has shown to be safe, the additional protection against such a condition inherent to a geometry-limited airplane would allow the V_{MU} and V_{LOF} speed margin to be reduced while providing the same level of safety. Currently, the FAA allows, by equivalent safety finding, a reduction in the V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margin for the all-engines-operating condition. The proposed standard would codify this practice and extend its application to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

Relative to current industry practice, does the proposed standard increase, decrease, or maintain the same level of safety?: Current industry practice varies. However, the proposed standard would not allow the level of safety to be reduced below that already practiced within the industry as a whole.

What other options have been considered and why were they not selected?: Other options that were considered were to retain either the existing FAR standard or the existing JAR standard. Retaining the existing FAR standard would provide a more stringent requirement, but it is anticipated that this would simply lead to more requests for equivalent safety findings and result in compliance with something close to the proposed standard.

Harmonizing on the JAR standard would not retain the existing level of safety for airplanes that are limited by elevator power. A lack of elevator power would not provide an equivalent level of protection against over-rotation as a geometry limit. In the elevator power limited case, in-service errors in determining the airplane center-of-gravity location or elevator trim position could override the elevator power limit.

Who would be affected by the proposed change?: Manufacturers and operators of transport category airplanes would be affected by the rule change. Operators could be affected to the extent that takeoff speeds, and hence, allowable takeoff weights could be affected by the proposed change. Because the proposed change is alleviating, operators may realize an economic benefit.

To ensure harmonization, what current advisory material (e.g., ACJ, AMJ, AC, policy letters) needs to be included in the rule text or preamble?: It should be stated in the preamble that an airplane that is deemed to be geometry-limited at the test conditions referenced in AC 25-7A is expected to be geometry-limited over its entire takeoff operating envelope. If not, the airplane is not considered geometry-limited and the reduced V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margins do not apply.

Is existing FAA advisory material adequate? (If not, what advisory material should be adopted?): The existing advisory material needs to be harmonized and revised to reflect the proposed harmonized standard.

Proposed advisory material: (AC 25-7A)

(viii) V_{MU} Testing for Geometry Limited Airplanes.

(A) For airplanes that are geometry limited (i.e., the minimum possible V_{MU} speeds are limited by tail contact with the runway), § 25.107(e)(1)(iv)(B) allows the V_{MU} to V_{LOF} speed margins to be reduced to 108 percent and 104 percent for the all-engines-operating and one-engine-inoperative conditions, respectively. The V_{MU} demonstrated must be sound and repeatable.

(B) One acceptable means for demonstrating compliance with §§ 25.107(d) and 25.107(e)(1)(iv) with respect to the capability for a safe liftoff and fly-away from the geometry limited condition is to show that at the lowest thrust-to-weight ratio for the all-engines-operating condition:

(1) During the speed range from 96 to 100 percent of the actual liftoff speed, the aft under-surface of the airplane should be in contact with the runway. Because of the dynamic nature of the test, it is recognized that contact will probably not be maintained during this entire speed range, and some judgment is necessary. It has been found acceptable for contact to exist approximately 50 percent of the time that the airplane is in this speed range.

(2) Beyond the point of liftoff to a height of 35 ft., the airplane's pitch attitude should not decrease below that at the point of liftoff, nor should the speed increase more than 10 percent.

(3) The horizontal distance from the start of the takeoff to a height of 35 feet should not be greater than 105 percent of the distance determined in accordance with § 25.113(a)(2) without the 115 percent factor.

How does the proposed standard compare to the current ICAO standards?: The ICAO standards do not contain specific requirements in this area.

Does the proposed standard affect other harmonization working groups?: No.

What is the cost impact of complying with the proposed standard?: The proposed standard would be cost beneficial in that there is a potential for a small increase in payload for geometry-limited airplanes than is currently available under the FAR with no change to the cost of certification. The proposed standard would have no effect on the cost of certifying or operating airplanes that are not deemed geometry-limited.

Does the working group want to review the draft NPRM prior to publication in the Federal Register?: Yes

In light of the information provided in this report, does the HWG consider that the "Fast Track" process is appropriate for this rulemaking project, or is the project too complex or controversial for the Fast Track Process. Explain: Yes, the "Fast Track" process is appropriate for this project. The project is neither too complex nor too controversial to use the "Fast Track" process.

FAA Action

[AEI]

Mr. Ron Priddy
President, Operations
National Air Carrier Association
1100 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1700
Arlington, VA 22209

Dear Mr. Priddy:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recently completed a regulatory program review. That review focused on prioritizing rulemaking initiatives to more efficiently and effectively use limited industry and regulatory rulemaking resources. The review resulted in an internal Regulation and Certification Rulemaking Priority List that will guide our rulemaking activities, including the tasking of initiatives to the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC). Part of the review determined if some rulemaking initiatives could be addressed by other than regulatory means, and considered products of ARAC that have been or are about to be forwarded to us as recommendations.

The Regulatory Agenda will continue to be the vehicle the FAA uses to communicate its rulemaking program to the public and the U.S. government. However, the FAA also wanted to identify for ARAC those ARAC rulemaking initiatives it is considering to handle by alternative actions (see the attached list). At this time, we have not yet determined what those alternative actions may be. We also have not eliminated the possibility that some of these actions in the future could be addressed through rulemaking when resources are available.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Gerri Robinson at (202) 267-9678 or gerri.robinson@faa.gov.

Sincerely,

Anthony F. Fazio
Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee

Enclosure

cc:
William W. Edmunds, Air Carrier Operation Issues
Sarah MacLeod, Air Carrier/General Aviation Maintenance Issues
James L. Crook, Air Traffic Issues
William H. Schultz, Aircraft Certification Procedures Issues
Ian Redhead, Airport Certification Issues

Billy Glover, Occupant Safety Issues
John Tigue, General Aviation Certification and Operations Issues
David Hilton, Noise Certification Issues
John Swihart, Rotorcraft Issues
Roland B. Liddell, Training and Qualification Issues
Craig Bolt, Transport Airplane and Engine Issues

ARAC Projects that will be handled by Alternative Actions rather than Rulemaking

(Beta) Reverse Thrust and propeller Pitch Setting below the Flight Regime (25.1155)
Fire Protection (33.17)
Rotor Integrity--Overspeed (33.27)
Safety Analysis (33.75)
Rotor Integrity – Over-torque (33.84)
2 Minute/30 Second One Engine Inoperative (OEI) (33.XX)
Bird Strike (25.775, 25.571, 25.631)
Casting Factors (25.621)
Certification of New Propulsion Technologies on Part 23 Airplanes
Electrical and Electronic Engine Control Systems (33.28)
Fast Track Harmonization Project: Engine and APU Loads Conditions (25.361, 25.362)
Fire Protection of Engine Cowling (25.1193(e)(3))
Flight Loads Validation (25.301)
Fuel Vent System Fire Protection (Part 25 and Retrofit Rule for Part 121, 125, and 135)
Ground Gust Conditions (25.415)
Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards Flight Rules, Static Lateral-Directional Stability, and Speed Increase and Recovery Characteristics (25.107(e)(1)(iv), 25.177©, 25.253(a)(3)(4)(50)). Note: 25.107(a)(b)(d) were enveloping tasks also included in this project—They will be included in the enveloping NPRM)
Harmonization of Part 1 Definitions Fireproof and Fire Resistant (25.1)
Jet and High Performance Part 23 Airplanes
Load and Dynamics (Continuous Turbulence Loads) (25.302, 25.305, 25.341 (b), etc.)
Restart Capability (25.903(e))
Standardization of Improved Small Airplane Normal Category Stall Characteristics Requirements (23.777, 23.781, 23.1141, 23.1309, 23.1337, 25.1305)

ATTC (25.904/App I)
Cargo Compartment Fire Extinguishing or Suppression Systems (25.851(b), 25.855, 25.857)
Proof of Structure (25.307)
High Altitude Flight (25.365(d))
Fatigue and Damage Tolerance (25.571)
Material Prosperities (25.604)

Federal Register

Wednesday,
August 8, 2007

Part III

Department of Transportation

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 25

Airplane Performance and Handling Qualities in Icing Conditions; Final Rule

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 25

[Docket No. FAA–2005–22840; Amendment No. 25–121]

RIN 2120–AI14

Airplane Performance and Handling Qualities in Icing Conditions

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action introduces new airworthiness standards to evaluate the performance and handling characteristics of transport category airplanes in icing conditions. This action will improve the level of safety for new airplane designs when operating in icing conditions, and harmonizes the U.S. and European airworthiness standards for flight in icing conditions.

DATES: This final rule becomes effective October 9, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Stimson, FAA, Airplane & Flight Crew Interface Branch, ANM–111, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98057–3356; telephone: (425) 227–1129; fax: (425) 227–1149, e-mail: *don.stimson@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Availability of Rulemaking Documents

You can get an electronic copy using the Internet by:

(1) Searching the Department of Transportation's electronic Docket Management System (DMS) Web page (*http://dms.dot.gov/search*);

(2) Visiting the FAA's Regulations and Policies Web page at *http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies;* or

(3) Accessing the Government Printing Office's Web page at *http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.html.*

You can also get a copy by sending a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, ARM–1, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–9680. Make sure to identify the docket number or amendment number of this rulemaking.

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78) or you may visit *http://dms.dot.gov.*

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) of 1996 requires the FAA to comply with small entity requests for information or advice about compliance with statutes and regulations within its jurisdiction. If you are a small entity and you have a question regarding this document, you may contact a local FAA official, or the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. You can find out more about SBREFA on the Internet at *http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/rulemaking/sbre_act/*.

Authority for This Rulemaking

The FAA's authority to issue rules regarding aviation safety is found in Title 49 of the United States Code. Subtitle I, Section 106 describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the agency's authority.

This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701, ''General requirements.'' Under that section, the FAA is charged with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing minimum standards required in the interest of safety for the design and performance of aircraft. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it prescribes new safety standards for the design of transport category airplanes.

I. Background

A. Statement of the Problem

Currently, § 25.1419, ''Ice protection,'' requires transport category airplanes with approved ice protection features be capable of operating safely within the icing conditions identified in appendix C of part 25. This section requires applicants to perform flight testing and conduct analyses to make this determination. Section 25.1419 only requires an applicant to demonstrate that the airplane can operate safely in icing conditions if the applicant is seeking to certificate ice protection features.

Although an airplane's performance capability and handling qualities are important in determining whether an airplane can operate safely, part 25 does not have specific requirements on airplane performance or handling qualities for flight in icing conditions. In addition, the FAA does not have a standard set of criteria defining what airplane performance capability and handling qualities are needed to be able to operate safely in icing conditions. Finally, § 25.1419 fails to address certification approval for flight in icing conditions for airplanes without ice protection features.

Service history shows that flight in icing conditions may be a safety risk for transport category airplanes. We found nine accidents since 1983 in the National Transportation Safety Board's accident database that may have been prevented if this rule had been in effect. In evaluating the potential for this rulemaking to avoid future accidents, we considered only past accidents involving tailplane stall or potential airframe ice accretion effects on drag or controllability. We did not consider accidents related to ground deicing since this amendment does not change the ground deicing requirements. We also limited our search to accidents involving aircraft certificated to the icing standards of part 25 (or its predecessor).

B. NTSB Recommendations

This amendment addresses the following National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) safety recommendations related to airframe icing:[1]

1. NTSB Safety Recommendation A–91–087 [2] recommended requiring flight tests where ice is accumulated in those cruise and approach flap configurations in which extensive exposure to icing conditions can be expected, and requiring subsequent changes in configuration to include landing flaps. This safety recommendation resulted from an accident that was attributed to tailplane stall due to ice contamination.

This amendment requires applicants to investigate the susceptibility of airplanes to ice-contaminated tailplane stall during airworthiness certification. An accompanying Advisory Circular (AC) will provide detailed guidance on acceptable means of compliance, including flight tests in icing conditions where the airplane's configuration is changed from flaps and landing gear retracted to flaps and landing gear in the landing position.

[1] Refer to appendix 3 of the NPRM for more details on these safety recommendations (except for A–96–056, which was not discussed in the NPRM).

[2] ''Effect of Ice on Aircraft Handling Characteristics (1984 Trials),'' Jetstream 31—G–JSSD, British Aerospace Flight Test Report FTR.177/JM, dated May 13, 1985.

2. NTSB Safety Recommendation A–96–056 [3] recommended revising the icing certification testing regulation to ensure that airplanes are properly tested for all conditions in which they are authorized to operate, or are otherwise shown to be capable of safe flight into such conditions. Additionally, if safe operations cannot be demonstrated by the manufacturer, operational limitations should be imposed to prohibit flight in such conditions and flightcrews should be provided with the means to positively determine when they are in icing conditions that exceed the limits for aircraft certification.

This amendment partially addresses safety recommendation A–96–056 by revising the certification standards to ensure that transport category airplanes are properly tested for the critical icing conditions defined in appendix C of part 25. We are considering future rulemaking action to address icing conditions beyond those covered by appendix C of part 25, and to provide flightcrews with a means to positively determine when they are in icing conditions that exceed the limits for aircraft certification.

3. NTSB Safety Recommendation A–98–094 [4] recommended that manufacturers of all turbine-engine driven airplanes (including the EMB–120) provide minimum maneuvering airspeed information for all airplane configurations, phases, and conditions of flight (icing and non-icing conditions). Also, the NTSB recommended that minimum airspeeds should take into consideration the effects of various types, amounts, and locations of ice accumulations, including thin amounts of very rough ice, ice accumulated in supercooled large droplet icing conditions, and tailplane icing.

This amendment partially addresses safety recommendation A–98–094 by requiring the same maneuvering capability requirements at the minimum operating speeds in the most critical icing conditions defined in appendix C of part 25 as are currently required in non-icing conditions. We are considering future rulemaking action to address supercooled large droplet icing conditions.

4. NTSB Safety Recommendation A–98–096 is also a result of the same accident discussed under Safety Recommendation A–98–094, above. The NTSB recommended the FAA require, during type certification, that manufacturers and operators of all transport category airplanes certificated to operate in icing conditions install stall warning/protection systems that provide a cockpit warning (aural warning and/or stick shaker) before the onset of stall when the airplane is operating in icing conditions.

This amendment requires adequate stall warning margin to be shown with the most critical ice accretion for transport category airplanes approved to fly in icing conditions. Except for the short time before icing conditions are recognized and the ice protection system activated, this stall warning must be provided by the same means as for non-icing conditions. Although neither an aural stall warning or stick shaker is required under this amendment, all recently certificated transport category airplanes have used either a stick shaker or an aural warning to warn the pilot of an impending stall. We do not anticipate any future transport category airplane designs without a cockpit warning of an impending stall.

C. Summary of the NPRM

This amendment is based on the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), Notice No. 05–10, which was published in the **Federal Register** on November 4, 2005 (70 FR 67278). In the NPRM, we proposed to revise the airworthiness standards for type certification of transport category airplanes to add a comprehensive set of new requirements for airplane performance and handling qualities for flight in icing conditions. We also proposed to add requirements that define the ice accretion (that is, the size, shape, location, and texture of the ice) that must be considered for each phase of flight.

These changes were proposed to ensure that minimum operating speeds determined during certification of all future transport category airplanes will provide adequate maneuver capability in icing conditions for all phases of flight and all airplane configurations. They would also harmonize the FAA's regulations with those expected to be adopted by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). This harmonization would not only benefit the aviation industry economically, but also maintain the necessary high level of aviation safety.

II. Discussion of the Final Rule

A. General Summary

Twelve commenters responded to the NPRM: Four private citizens, Airbus Industrie (Airbus), the Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), The Boeing Company (Boeing), Dassault Aviation (Dassault), the General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA), the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), Raytheon Aircraft Company (Raytheon), and the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority (U.K. CAA).

Seven of these commenters explicitly expressed support for the rule, none opposed it. Many of the commenters suggested specific improvements or clarifications. Summaries of their comments and our responses (including explanations of changes to the final rule in response to the comments) are provided below.[5]

1. Engine Bleed Configuration for Showing Compliance With § 25.119

The proposed § 25.119 would require applicants to comply with the landing climb performance requirements in both icing and non-icing conditions. Raytheon stated that proposed § 25.119(b) is unclear as to whether the engine bleed configuration for showing compliance should include bleed extraction for operation of the airframe and engine ice protection systems (IPS). Raytheon pointed out that engine bleed extraction for operating the airframe and engine IPS could affect engine acceleration time, which would affect the thrust level used for showing compliance. Raytheon noted that the means of compliance in the proposed AC addresses this issue, but recommended that it be clarified within the rule.

While we agree that engine bleed extraction could affect the thrust level used to show compliance with § 25.119(b), we disagree that the rule needs to be revised to state the bleed configuration. For flight in icing conditions, § 25.21(g)(1) requires compliance to be shown assuming normal operation of the airplane and its IPS in accordance with the operating limitations and operating procedures established by the applicant and provided in the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM). The bleed configuration of the engines would be part of the AFM operating procedures that must be used to show compliance with § 25.119(b). As noted by Raytheon, the guidance provided in the AC accompanying this final rule reminds applicants that the

[3] National Transportation Safety Board, 1996. ''In-Flight Icing Encounter and Loss of Control, Simmons Airlines, d.b.a.American Eagle Flight 4184, Avions de Transport Regional (ATR) Model 72–212, N401AM, Roselawn, Indiana, October 31, 1994.'' Aircraft Accident Report NTSB/AAR–96/01. Washington, DC.

[4] National Transportation Safety Board, 1998. ''In-Flight Icing Encounter and Uncontrolled Collision With Terrain, Comair Flight 3272, Embraer EMB–120RT, N265CA, Monroe, Michigan, January 9, 1997.'' Aircraft Accident Report NTSB/AR–98/04. Washington, DC.

[5] The full text of each commenter's submission is available in the Docket.

engine bleed configuration should be considered when showing compliance with the requirements of this final rule.

2. Using the Landing Ice Accretion To Comply With § 25.121(d)(2)(ii)

Boeing proposed using the landing ice accretion for showing compliance with the approach climb gradient requirement in icing conditions, rather than the holding ice accretion as proposed in § 25.121(d)(2)(ii). Boeing recommended this change to harmonize with EASA's proposed rule.

We consider it inappropriate to use the landing ice accretion for compliance with § 25.121(d). Section 25.121(d) specifies the minimum climb capability, in terms of a climb gradient, that an airplane must be capable of achieving in the approach configuration with one engine inoperative. This requirement involves the approach phase of flight, which occurs before entering the landing phase. Depending on the IPS design and the procedures for its use, the landing ice accretion (which is defined as the ice accretion after exiting the holding phase and transitioning to the landing phase) may be smaller than the holding ice accretion. For example, there may be a procedure to use the IPS to remove the ice when transitioning to the landing phase so that the protected areas are clear of ice for landing. It would be inappropriate to allow any reduction in the ice accretion to be used for the approach climb gradient (in the approach phase) resulting from using the IPS in the landing phase.

We note that neither EASA's Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) covering the same icing-related safety issues (NPA 16/2004) nor our NPRM define an ice accretion specific to the approach phase of flight. Both proposals used holding ice for compliance in icing conditions because holding ice was considered to be conservative for this flight phase. Therefore, we believe that it is appropriate to define an additional ice accretion that would be specifically targeted at the approach phase of flight. We have added the following definition as paragraph (a)(5) in part II of appendix C:

''Approach ice is the critical ice accretion on the unprotected parts of the airplane, and any ice accretion on the protected parts appropriate to normal IPS operation following exit from the holding flight phase and transition to the most critical approach configuration.''

Section 25.121(d)(2)(ii) is also revised to refer to this definition. The definition of landing ice is revised to be the ice accretion after exiting from the approach phase (rather than after the holding phase as proposed) and redesignated as paragraph (a)(6).

Finally, applicants would still have the option to use a more conservative ice accretion in accordance with paragraph (b) of part II of appendix C. Therefore, applicants would have the option of using the holding ice accretion as proposed in the NPRM if it was more critical than the approach ice accretion.

3. V_{REF} Comparison at Maximum Landing Weight

Proposed § 25.125(a)(2) would require landing distances to be determined in icing conditions if the landing approach speed, V_{REF}, for icing conditions exceeds V_{REF} for non-icing conditions by more than 5 knots calibrated airspeed. Boeing proposed that the V_{REF} speed comparison for icing and non-icing conditions in proposed § 25.125(a)(2) be made at the maximum landing weight. This proposal would harmonize the FAA's rule with the expected EASA final rule. Boeing also stated that the proposed rule was deficient in that it did not specify the weight or weights at which this comparison must be made. The results of this comparison can depend on the weight at which the comparison is made.

We agree that this comparison should be made at the maximum landing weight and have revised § 25.125(a)(2) of the final rule accordingly. We consider this to be a clarifying change that will not impose an additional burden on applicants.

4. Landing Distance in Icing Conditions

As noted in the discussion of the previous comment, proposed § 25.125(a)(2) would require the landing distance to be determined in icing conditions if the landing approach speed, V_{REF}, for icing conditions exceeds the non-icing V_{REF} by more than 5 knots calibrated airspeed. An increase in V_{REF} for icing conditions is normally caused by an increase in stall speed in icing conditions because V_{REF} must be at least 1.23 times the stall speed.

Raytheon noted that a change in stall speed is not the only factor that might affect landing distance in icing conditions. For example, idle thrust might be adjusted by an engine control system designed to maintain sufficient bleed flow to support the demands of engine and airframe ice protection. Also, landing procedures for icing conditions might be different than for non-icing conditions. Raytheon suggested revising proposed § 25.125(a)(2) to require that the landing distance must also be determined in icing conditions if the thrust settings or landing procedures used in icing conditions would cause an increase in the landing distance.

One of the primary safety concerns addressed by proposed § 25.125 is to maintain a minimum speed margin above the stall speed for an approach and landing in icing conditions. This is achieved by increasing the landing approach speed (V_{REF}) if ice on the airplane results in a significant increase in stall speed. Under proposed § 25.125(b)(2)(ii)(B), a significant increase in stall speed relative to this requirement is one that results in an increase in V_{REF} of more than 5 knots calibrated airspeed, where V_{REF} is not less than 1.23 times the stall speed.

An increase in V_{REF} will increase the distance required by the airplane to land and come to a stop since the airplane will touch down at a higher speed. A significant increase in stall speed in the landing configuration due to ice has a secondary effect of increasing the required landing distance. We proposed in § 25.125(a)(2) that this increase in landing distance be taken into account. Proposed § 25.125(a)(2) resulted from the secondary effect of a significant increase in stall speed in the landing configuration due to ice, not to an evaluation of all of the possible reasons why the required landing distance may need to be longer in icing conditions. The commenter correctly points out that a longer landing distance may also be needed if higher thrust settings or different landing procedures are used in icing conditions.

In evaluating the potential costs and effects of the proposed change, we could not find any existing airplanes where, if the requirement proposed by the commenter had been in effect, it would have required an applicant to determine a longer landing distance in icing conditions. In nearly all cases, applicants have not used different thrust or power settings or different procedures for landing in icing conditions. Airplane manufacturers indicated that they did not anticipate this relationship to change for future designs.

When different thrust or power settings or procedures have been used for landing in icing conditions, V_{REF} has also increased by more than 5 knots. In these cases, applicants would be required by the proposed § 25.125(a) to determine the landing distance for icing conditions, and existing § 25.101(c) and (f) require applicants to include the effects of different power or thrust settings or landing procedures on this landing distance.

Therefore, we see no need to amend the proposed requirement as recommended by Raytheon.

5. Sandpaper Ice Accretion

Proposed appendix C, part II(a)(6) defined sandpaper ice as a thin, rough layer of ice. A private citizen notes the NPRM did not specifically state how sandpaper ice should be used or considered in showing compliance with any of the proposed airplane performance and handling qualities requirements. This commenter suggested amending proposed § 25.143(i)(1) to add that if normal operation of the horizontal tail IPS allows ice to form on the tail leading edge, sandpaper ice must also be considered in determining the critical ice accretion. (Proposed § 25.143(i)(1) would require applicants to demonstrate the airplane is safely controllable, per the applicable requirements of § 25.143, with the ice accretion defined in appendix C that is most critical for the particular flight phase.)

Appendix C, part II(a) requires applicants to use the most critical ice accretion to show compliance with the applicable subpart B airplane performance and handling requirements in icing conditions. The determination of the most critical ice accretion must consider the full range of atmospheric icing conditions of part I of appendix C as well as the characteristics of the IPS (per § 25.21(g)(1) and appendix C, part II(a)). This includes consideration of thin, rough layers of ice (known as sandpaper ice) as well as any other type of ice accretion that may occur in the applicable atmospheric icing conditions, taking into account the operating characteristics of the IPS and the flight phase.

Since the requirement to use the most critical ice accretion includes consideration of sandpaper ice and sandpaper ice is not referenced elsewhere in the rule, we have removed appendix C, part II(a)(6) from the final rule. The AC that we are issuing along with this final rule, or shortly thereafter, provides further information on the use of sandpaper ice in showing compliance. (This AC will be available in the Regulatory Guidance Library (RGL) when issued.)

6. Critical Ice Accretion for Showing Compliance With § 25.143(i)(1)

As noted in the discussion of the previous comment, proposed § 25.143(i)(1) would require applicants to demonstrate the airplane is safely controllable, per the applicable requirements of § 25.143, with the ice accretion defined in appendix C that is most critical for the particular flight phase. Raytheon stated that because ice accretion before normal system operation is addressed separately in § 25.143(j), the controllability demonstration required by § 25.143(i)(1) should be limited to only the most critical ice accretion defined in appendix C part II(a) rather than all of appendix C.

For purposes of the controllability demonstrations required by § 25.143(i)(1), appendix C, parts I and II(a), (b), (c), and (d) apply. Appendix C, part II(e) only applies to §§ 25.143(j) and 25.207(h), which are the only subpart B requirements pertaining to flight in icing conditions before activation of the IPS. We acknowledge that this limited applicability of appendix C, part II(e) is unclear in the language proposed, and we have revised the final rule to include a sentence that specifies this limitation.

7. Pushover Maneuver for Ice-Contaminated Tailplane Stall Evaluation

Raytheon stated that proposed § 25.143(i)(2), which states that a push force from the pilot must be required throughout a pushover maneuver down to zero g or full down elevator, is inconsistent with allowing a pull force for recovery from the maneuver. Raytheon noted that the FAA stated in the NPRM that a force reversal (that is, a push force becoming a pull force) is unacceptable, implying that the pilot should only be permitted to relax his or her push force to initiate recovery. The 50-pound limit for recovery in the proposed § 25.143(i)(2) appears to allow up to 50 pounds of force reversal to develop during the maneuver, including at the initiation of recovery from the maneuver. Raytheon stated that they object to the proposed requirement and continue to support the industry proposal for the pushover maneuver submitted to ARAC by the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group. The industry proposal specified there must be no force reversal down to 0.5 g (the limit of the operational flight envelope) and a prompt recovery from zero g (or full down elevator control if zero g cannot be obtained) with less than 50 pounds of stick force. Raytheon stated that the 50-pound pull force was not intended as a limit for the subsequent pull-up maneuver during recovery from the push-over test.

The FAA continues to disagree with the industry proposal, and Raytheon did not offer any new evidence or rationale that would lead us to reconsider our position. As stated in the NPRM, certification testing and service experience have shown that testing to only 0.5 g is inadequate, considering the relatively high frequency of experiencing 0.5 g in operations. Since the beginning of the 1980s, the practice of many certification authorities has been to require testing to lower load factors. The industry proposal for determining the acceptability of a control force reversal (as described in the NPRM) was subjective and would have led to inconsistent evaluations. Requiring a push force to zero g removes subjectivity in the assessment of the airplane's controllability and provides readily understood criteria of acceptability. Any lesser standard would not give confidence that the problem has been fully addressed.

We do not consider the requirement for a push force to be needed to reach zero g, coupled with allowing a pull force of up to 50 pounds during the recovery, to be inconsistent with our position that force reversals are unacceptable within the normal flight envelope. The pushover maneuver ends when zero g is reached (or when full down elevator is achieved if zero g cannot be reached). The recovery is a separate pull-up maneuver, initiated by the pilot, to regain the original flight path. It is acceptable for this maneuver to require a pull force, but the pull force must not exceed 50 pounds, which is the maximum pitch force permitted by the existing § 25.143(c) (renumbered as § 25.143(d) by this amendment) for short term application of force using one hand. No changes were made.

8. Pushover Maneuver Limited by Design Features Other Than Elevator Power

Airbus noted that proposed § 25.143(i)(2) would allow the required pushover maneuver to end before zero g is reached if the airplane is limited by elevator power. Airbus commented that safe design characteristics other than limited elevator power may also prevent an aircraft from reaching zero g during the pushover maneuver (e.g., flight envelope protections designed into fly-by-wire control systems). Airbus proposed revising the proposed rule to allow the pushover maneuver to end before reaching zero g for other safe design characteristics that prevent reaching zero g.

We agree with Airbus and have revised § 25.143(i)(2) to include consideration of other design characteristics of the flight control system that may prevent reaching zero g in the pushover maneuver.

9. Pitch Force Requirements During a Sideslip Maneuver

Raytheon stated that the proposed requirement for flight in icing conditions is more stringent than the requirements applicable to non-icing conditions. Proposed § 25.143(i)(3) would require that any changes in force that the pilot must apply to the pitch control to maintain speed with increasing sideslip angle must be steadily increasing with no force reversals. Raytheon notes the non-icing subpart B static lateral-directional stability requirements of § 25.177 do not specify that the pitch forces cannot reverse. For example, a push force at small sideslip angles that changes to a pull force as sideslip increases is acceptable.

Raytheon noted that it would not be unusual for an airplane to require an increase in pull force with increasing sideslip. If the tailplane or a portion of it developed aerodynamic separation as sideslip increases, then to maintain 1–g flight the elevator hinge moment would require further pull force that could be sudden or become excessive. Raytheon notes this undesirable characteristic would comply with proposed § 25.143(i)(3).

Raytheon and another commenter (a private citizen) proposed that the proposed rule be revised to eliminate the requirements that the pitch force be steadily increasing with increasing sideslip and that there be no reversal. Instead, these commenters suggested that the requirement should be limited to ensuring that there is no abrupt or uncontrollable pitching tendency.

The FAA agrees with the commenters that small, gradual changes in the pitch control force may not be objectionable or unsafe, and that the proposed requirement is unnecessarily more stringent than the requirements for non-icing conditions. The safety concern is sudden or large pitch force changes that would be difficult for the pilot to control. Therefore, we have changed § 25.143(i)(3) in the final rule to read as follows:

''Any changes in force that the pilot must apply to the pitch control to maintain speed with increasing sideslip angle must be steadily increasing with no force reversals, unless the change in control force is gradual and easily controllable by the pilot without using exceptional piloting skill, alertness, or strength.''

Under this new language, abrupt changes in the control force characteristic, unless so small as to be unnoticeable, would not be considered to meet the requirement that the force be steadily increasing. A gradual change in control force is a change that is not abrupt and does not have a steep gradient. It can be easily managed by a pilot of average skill, alertness, and strength. Control forces in excess of those permitted by § 25.143(d) would be considered excessive.

10. Stall Warning in Icing Conditions

Existing § 25.207(c) requires at least a 3 knot or 3% speed margin between the stall warning speed (V_{SW}) and the reference stall speed (V_{SR}). Existing § 25.207(d) requires at least a 5 knot or 5% speed margin between V_{SW} and the speed at which the behavior of the airplane gives the pilot a clear and distinctive indication of an acceptable nature that the airplane is stalled. Under proposed § 25.21(g), the stall warning requirements of § 25.207(c) and (d) would apply only to non-icing conditions. For icing conditions, proposed § 25.207(e) requires that stall warning be sufficient to allow the pilot to prevent stalling when the pilot starts the recovery maneuver not less than 3 seconds after the onset of stall warning in a one knot per second deceleration.

The U.K. CAA noted that proposed § 25.207(e) would allow stall warning in icing conditions to occur at a speed slower than the speed for the maximum lift capability of the wing (also known as the 1g stall speed). This would not be true for non-icing conditions because of § 25.207(c). According to U.K. CAA, if the stall warning speed is slower than the 1g stall speed, the airplane will have little or no maneuvering capability at the point that the airplane gives the pilot a warning of an impending stall. The U.K. CAA stated that in an operational scenario, if the airplane slows to a speed slightly above the stall warning speed, any attempt to maneuver the airplane or further reduce speed could lead to an immediate stall. This situation is of most concern to the U.K. CAA in the landing phase because, unlike the cruise or takeoff phases, there are limited options for the crew to recover from a stall. The airplane is already at low altitude and descending towards the ground, the power setting is low, and the potential to trade height for speed is extremely limited.

Due to this concern, the U.K. CAA recommended making the non-icing stall warning speed margin requirements of § 25.207(c) and (d) also apply to icing conditions, but only when the airplane is in the landing configuration. Since the proposed § 25.207(e) was intended to be used in place of § 25.207(c) and (d) for icing conditions, the U.K. CAA suggested that, if § 25.207(c) and (d) are applied to the landing configuration in icing conditions, then § 25.207(e) need not be applied to the landing configuration.

In developing the proposed rule, the FAA accepted a determination by the Flight Test Harmonization Working Group (FTHWG) that the same handling qualities standards should generally apply to flight in icing conditions as apply to flight in non-icing conditions. In certain areas, however, the FTHWG decided that the handling qualities standards for non-icing conditions were inappropriate for flight in icing conditions. In these areas, the FTHWG recommended alternative criteria for flight in icing conditions.

The stall warning margin was one of the areas where the FTHWG recommended alternative criteria for flight in icing conditions. The FTHWG determined that applying the existing stall warning margin requirements of § 25.207(c) and (d) to icing conditions would be far more stringent than the best current practices and would unduly penalize designs that have not exhibited safety problems in icing conditions. The FTHWG further determined the stall warning requirements of the existing § 25.207(c) and (d) could be made less stringent for icing conditions without compromising safety. As a result, we proposed the less stringent § 25.207(e) to address stall warning margin requirements for icing conditions in place of § 25.207(c) and (d).

No changes have been made to this final rule as a result of the U.K. CAA's comment. We acknowledge that the U.K. CAA has pointed out a deficiency with safety implications in the proposed stall warning requirements. However, U.S. manufacturers' initial cost analysis of the U.K. CAA's recommended changes indicates these changes may significantly increase the costs of this rulemaking beyond the benefits provided due to uncertainties in how the increased stall warning margin requirement would affect airplane type certification testing, certification program schedules, and the design of stall warning systems.

In addition, the U.K. CAA's recommended changes would introduce significant regulatory differences from EASA's airworthiness certification requirements, and might not completely resolve the potential safety issue. For these reasons we believe that additional time and aviation industry participation are needed to determine an appropriate way to address this safety concern. However, we do not believe it is appropriate to delay issuance of this final rule pending resolution of this issue.

This final rule significantly improves the affected airworthiness standards and the benefits of these improvements should be achieved as soon as possible. It also satisfies a number of important NTSB recommendations. As these improvements are being implemented, we will continue to work closely with EASA and industry to address the issue raised by the U.K. CAA. This subject has been included on EASA's 2008 rulemaking agenda, and we will work with them in that context to agree on a harmonized approach. Once these efforts are completed, we will initiate new rulemaking, if appropriate, to adopt any necessary revisions to part 25.

11. Stall and Stall Warning Requirements Prior to Activation of the IPS

Proposed § 25.207(h)(2)(ii) would require compliance with the stall characteristics requirements of § 25.203, using the stall demonstration prescribed by § 25.201, for flight in icing conditions before the IPS is activated. This requirement would apply if the stall warning required by § 25.207 is provided by a different means for flight in icing conditions than for non-icing conditions. The stall demonstration prescribed by § 25.201 requires that the stalling maneuver be continued to the point where the airplane gives the pilot a clear and distinctive indication of an acceptable nature that the airplane is stalled.

Raytheon disagreed with this proposal because the ice accretion resulting from a delay in activating the IPS is a short term transient condition. According to Raytheon, the intent should be to demonstrate only the ability to prevent a stall, rather than to also ensure that the airplane has good stall characteristics. Raytheon stated that it is unnecessary to consider that the pilot might ignore the stall buffeting and continue to increase angle-of-attack until the airplane is stalled. To comply with the proposed rule, Raytheon argued that an airplane with a stick pusher stall identification system would be required to have its stick pusher activation based on a contaminated wing leading edge for non-icing conditions. This would require increased takeoff and landing speeds and negatively impact all takeoff and landing performance.

Raytheon also stated that the cost impacts would be excessive for what is only a transient condition. Raytheon's position is that there is no need to consider the airplane's handling qualities after it has stalled. It should be sufficient to show that the pilot can prevent stalling if the recovery maneuver is not begun until at least three seconds after the onset of stall warning, which is also required by the proposed § 25.207(h)(2)(ii).

We do not agree with Raytheon's comments. Because of human factors considerations, proposed § 25.207(b) generally requires that the same means of providing a stall warning be used in both icing and non-icing conditions. Therefore, if a stick shaker is used for stall warning in non-icing conditions (as is the case for most transport category airplanes) it must also be used for stall warning in icing conditions. The reason for this proposed requirement is that in icing accidents and incidents where the airplane stalled before the stick shaker activated, flightcrews have not recognized the buffeting associated with ice contamination in time to prevent stalling. Proposed § 25.207(h)(2)(ii) allows a different means of providing stall warning in icing conditions only for the relatively short time period between when the airplane first enters icing conditions and when the IPS is activated. (This exception to the proposed § 25.207(b) is further limited such that it only applies when the procedures for activating the IPS do not involve waiting until a certain amount of ice has been accumulated.)

Because there is still a safety concern with flightcrews recognizing a stall warning that is provided by a different means than the flightcrew would normally experience, we consider it essential that the airplane also be shown to have safe stall characteristics. Poor stalling characteristics with an iced wing have directly contributed to the severity of icing accidents involving a stall in icing conditions.

As for Raytheon's comment about the cost impacts, we evaluated these as part of the regulatory evaluation conducted for the NPRM, and we do not agree that the cost impacts associated with this requirement are excessive. In addition, the adopted § 25.207 will not require airplanes with stick pusher stall identification systems to have their stick pusher activation based on a contaminated wing leading edge for non-icing conditions. Section 25.207(h)(2)(ii) does not apply if the same stall warning means is used for non-icing and icing conditions. If a stick shaker is used for stall warning and if the stick shaker activation point must be advanced due to the effect of the ice accreted before activation of the IPS, this would result in the same negative effect on takeoff and landing speeds. However, if the procedures for activating the IPS ensure that it is activated before any ice accretes on the wings, neither the stick shaker activation point nor the takeoff and landing speeds will be affected. This could be accomplished, for example, by using an ice detector that would activate the IPS before ice accretes on the wings, or by procedures for activating the IPS based on environmental conditions conducive to icing, but before ice would actually accrete on the wings.

12. Dissipation of Ice Shapes at High Altitudes and High Mach Numbers

Proposed § 25.253(c) specifies the maximum speed for demonstrating stability characteristics in icing conditions. Proposed § 25.253(c)(3) allows this speed to be limited to the speed at which it is demonstrated that the airframe will be free of ice accretion due to the effects of increased dynamic pressure. Raytheon stated that experience has shown that ice shapes dissipate quickly at high altitude and high Mach numbers. Raytheon suggested revising § 25.253(c)(3) to specify the altitude and/or Mach number range that ice shapes would dissipate.

Although we agree that past experience shows that ice shapes dissipate or detach at high altitude and high Mach numbers, the applicable range may vary with airplane type. The particular conditions under which the ice accretions dissipate or detach should be justified as part of the certification program. Since this is consistent with proposed § 25.253(c), we made no changes to the final rule.

13. Critical Ice Shapes

Proposed appendix C, part II(a) defines how to determine the critical ice accretions for each phase of flight. The NTSB commented that for each phase of flight, the applicant should be required to demonstrate that the shape, chordwise and spanwise, and the roughness of the shapes accurately reflect the full range of appendix C conditions in terms of mean effective drop diameter, liquid water content, and temperature during each phase of flight. Additionally, the NTSB suggested that we review the justification and selection of the most critical ice shape for each phase of flight.

Although we believe the proposed requirements already address the NTSB's concerns, we have revised appendix C, part II(a) for additional clarity. We added text to state that applicants must demonstrate that the full range of atmospheric icing conditions specified in part I of appendix C have been considered, including the mean effective drop diameter, liquid water content, and temperature appropriate to the flight conditions.

14. Takeoff Ice Accretions

ALPA noted that the takeoff ice accretions defined in proposed appendix C, part II(a)(2) do not include the entire takeoff flight path. As defined in § 25.111, the takeoff flight path ends at either 1,500 feet above the takeoff surface, or the height at which the transition from the takeoff to the en route configuration is completed and the final takeoff speed (V_{FTO}) is reached, whichever is higher. The takeoff flight path in proposed appendix C, part II(a)(2) ends at 1,500 feet above the takeoff surface. ALPA stated that there are many mountainous airport locations where the takeoff configuration must be maintained above 1,500 feet above the takeoff surface for terrain clearance at maximum takeoff gross weights. Since winter operations in these locations often involve icing conditions, ALPA requested that the takeoff flight path of Appendix C, part II(a)(2) be revised to match that of § 25.111.

ALPA's comment points out an oversight in the text of the proposal. Appendix C, part II(a)(2) has been revised to include the entire takeoff flight path as defined in § 25.111. We consider this to be a technical clarification that does not impose a significant additional burden on applicants.

15. Size of Ice Accretion Before Activation of the IPS

For the pre-activation ice identified in Appendix C, part II(e), ALPA did not support the 30-second time period for the flightcrew to see and respond to ice accreting on the airplane as stated in paragraphs 2c(4)(a) and (b) of Appendix 1, Airframe Ice Accretion, of proposed AC 25.21–1X. ALPA believes that the ice accreted during a more operationally realistic timeframe and the potential degradations in aircraft performance and handling qualities must be accounted for during certification in order to make the proposed requirements and acceptable means of compliance an effective combination. While a well designed human factors study could determine an appropriate time, ALPA proposed that at least the 2-minute time period contained in 14 CFR 33.77, Foreign object ingestion—ice, be used as the time to visually recognize ice is accreting until definitive studies can be completed.

The FAA believes that ALPA has misunderstood the use of the 30-second time period in the proposed AC 25.21–1X acceptable means of compliance. The FAA does not expect the flightcrew to see and respond to ice accumulating on the airplane within 30 seconds. In accordance with § 25.21(g), compliance must be shown using ice accretions consistent with the AFM operating procedures. First, applicants must determine the ice accretion that would be on the airplane when the AFM procedures call for activating the IPS. Then, the 30-second time period is used in combination with the continuous maximum icing environment, as defined in appendix C of part 25, as a standard for determining the additional ice that could accrete on the airplane before the pilot actually activates the IPS. Since the appendix C maximum continuous icing envelope represents at least the 99th percentile of encounters with continuous maximum icing (that is, 99% of the time, less icing would occur), it would take significantly longer than 30 seconds in nearly all actual icing events for the airplane to accrete this much ice.

As a result of this comment, the FAA reviewed the proposed AC 25.21–1X text. Although the use of a-30 second time period in a continuous maximum icing environment is clearly stated, the FAA believes that the text is incomplete regarding what we expect applicants to consider in determining the ice accretion specified by the AFM procedures for activating the IPS. The FAA is revising the proposed AC to state that this ice accretion should be easily recognizable by the pilot under all foreseeable conditions (for example, at night in clouds). No changes have been made to the regulatory requirements.

16. Maximum Size of the Critical Ice Accretion

Dassault noted that, in Europe, the critical ice accretion is limited to a maximum thickness of 3 inches. Dassault did not find such a limitation in the NPRM, nor in the proposed advisory circular (AC) 25.21–1X related to the NPRM. Dassault noted that this omission could result in carrying out performance and handling tests with unrealistic ice accretions (particularly those assumed to build up on the unprotected parts of the airplane during the 45-minute holding flight phase referenced in ACs 25.21–X and 25.1419–1A).

We did not make any changes to the final rule because several existing ACs provide guidance for the size of the most critical ice accretions that should be considered. This longstanding guidance considers a 45-minute holding condition within an icing cloud. Since this guidance is not regulatory, we have accepted applicants' use of service history and other experience with other compliance criteria to determine the maximum ice accretion that needs to be considered. We will continue to address this issue in the same manner. The AC being issued along with this final rule refers to these alternative methods of compliance and provides guidance for their use.

17. Detection of Icing Conditions

A private citizen commented that icing conditions should be monitored by more than the pilot's eyesight. We are unable to address the commenter's issue in this rulemaking because this rulemaking only addresses performance and handling qualities requirements for the current methods of ice detection (which include detection by visual means). However, we are pursuing separate rulemaking for future airplane designs relative to allowable methods for detecting icing and determining when to activate the IPS. In NPRM 07–07, ''Activation of Ice Protection,'' published in the **Federal Register** on April 26, 2007, we proposed to amend the airworthiness standards applicable to transport category airplanes to require a means to ensure timely activation of the airframe IPS.

18. Delayed Activation of the IPS

ALPA recommended modifying all rule language to eliminate references and rule provisions for waiting until a finite amount of ice has accumulated before activating the IPS. ALPA stated that delayed activation of the IPS has been a factor in several accidents and incidents. ALPA also pointed out that the FAA has adopted 17 airworthiness directives requiring immediate activation of IPS at the first sign of ice accretion for a number of airplane types where the previous practice was to wait until a specified amount of ice had accumulated on the airplane. ALPA noted that after an exhaustive review of accident and incident data, ARAC recommended an operating rule that would remove the option of delaying activation of the IPS.

Except for the airworthiness directives referenced by ALPA, current regulations do not prohibit AFM procedures that call for delaying activation of the IPS until a specified amount of ice has accreted. Although we strongly encourage activating the IPS at the first sign of ice accretion, there may be some designs for which delayed activation is currently acceptable, safe, and appropriate. For example, some thermal wing IPS can currently be used in either an anti-ice or deice mode. In the deice mode, the wing IPS is not activated until a certain amount of ice has accreted. This has not resulted in any safety issues, and can be a more economical way of operating the wing IPS.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to provide appropriate performance and handling qualities requirements, considering the currently accepted procedures for activating the IPS. Establishing new requirements for acceptable methods for activating the IPS is beyond the scope of this rulemaking. As ALPA noted, however, ARAC has recommended the FAA adopt new requirements that would ensure flightcrews are provided with a clear means to know when to activate the IPS in a timely manner. We are pursuing separate rulemaking in response to this ARAC recommendation. In NPRM 07–07, ''Activation of Ice Protection,'' published in the **Federal Register** on April 26, 2007, we proposed to amend the airworthiness standards applicable to transport category airplanes to require a means to ensure timely activation of the airframe IPS. We will update the requirements adopted by this final rule related to the means of activating the IPS, if necessary, to be consistent with any final action resulting from NPRM 07–07, ''Activation of Ice Protection.''

19. Harmonization With EASA's NPA

Several commenters noted that the FAA did not fully harmonize the NPRM with the EASA's NPA covering the same icing-related safety issues. They recommended harmonizing the two rule proposals.

We worked closely with EASA to ensure that there are no significant regulatory differences between this amendment and EASA's anticipated final rule. However, since EASA's final rule has not yet been issued, we cannot guarantee that the two final rules will be completely harmonized. We believe that any differences will be primarily editorial and not significant regulatory differences.

20. Accuracy of the Regulatory Flexibility Evaluation

GAMA requested that the FAA review the regulatory flexibility evaluation in the interest of accuracy.

We reviewed the regulatory flexibility evaluation and reaffirmed the determination that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. All U.S. part 25 aircraft manufacturers exceed the Small Business Administration small-entity criteria of 1,500 employees for aircraft manufacturers.

21. Aircraft Population Used When Determining Cost Versus Benefit

GAMA stated that it appeared the cost proposal considered U.S. manufactured aircraft while the benefit section included international products. GAMA believes that the same aircraft population should be used when determining cost versus benefit. Additionally, GAMA stated that it appeared it was assumed that cost was only attributed to entirely new TC products. GAMA believes it would be appropriate to consider the economic impact to some amount of amended TC and STC projects as well.

Section 1 of Executive Order 12866 states ''Federal agencies should promulgate only such regulations as are required by law, are necessary to interpret the law, or are made necessary by compelling public need, such as material failures of private markets to protect or improve the health and safety of the public, the environment, or the well-being of the American people.'' Section 5 states ''In order to reduce the regulatory burden on the American people, their families, their communities, their State, local, and tribal governments and their industries * * *.'' Therefore, regulatory evaluations and flexibility analyses focus on American people and American industries.

American industries, such as manufacturers and operators of aircraft, must comply with regulations promulgated by Federal agencies. Foreign firms are not required to comply with U.S. regulations unless they choose to sell or operate their aircraft in America.

We determined the costs for this proposal by analyzing only American manufacturing industries, since foreign firms are not required to comply with U.S. regulations unless they choose to sell or operate their aircraft in America. While we do consider foreign manufactured aircraft in the benefit section, we determined the benefits by analyzing only American operators of those aircraft. Hence, the intent of Executive Order 12866 was satisfied.

We did include amended TCs in the analysis. Each TC includes all derivatives for a particular aircraft model. For example, TC No. A16WE initially covered only the Boeing 737–100, but was later amended to include the –200 through –900 Boeing 737 models.

Future applicants for approval of changed products are subject to § 21.101 (Changed Product Rule). There are several provisions of § 21.101 allowing future applicants of changed products to comply with earlier regulation amendments. We have already determined that benefits of the Changed Product Rule exceed the costs. Therefore, we do not estimate the benefits and costs of changed products for new certification rules.

22. Value of Fatalities Avoided

A private citizen claimed that the value of the fatalities avoided by this proposal would be in the neighborhood of $20 billion.

The number of averted fatalities and injuries is based on the historical accident rate extrapolated into the future. The FAA used $3.0 million for an avoided fatality and $132,700 for the additional associated medical and legal costs' for a fatality. The derivation for these values is discussed in the ''Economic Values for FAA Investment and Regulatory Decisions, A Guide.'' [6] Without the rule, we expect that over the 45-year analysis period, approximately three accidents will occur. These three accidents are expected to result in approximately 12 fatalities, six serious injuries, and two minor injuries. From these values, and expected future accidents based on past accident history, we estimated a benefit of about $90 million over the 45-year analysis period.

III. Rulemaking Analyses and Notices

Paperwork Reduction Act

There are no current or new requirements for information collection associated with this amendment.

International Compatibility

In keeping with U.S. obligations under the Convention on International Civil Aviation, it is FAA policy to comply with International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Standards and Recommended Practices to the maximum extent practicable. The FAA has determined that there are no ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices that correspond to these regulations.

Economic Assessment, Regulatory Flexibility Determination, Trade Impact Assessment, and Unfunded Mandates Assessment

Changes to Federal regulations must undergo several economic analyses. First, Executive Order 12866 directs each Federal agency to propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs.

[6] *http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/benefit_cost/media/050404%20Critical%20Values%20Dec%2031%20Report%2007Jan05.pdf.*

Second, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires agencies to analyze the economic impact of regulatory changes on small entities. Third, the Trade Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 2531–2533) prohibits agencies from setting standards that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. In developing U.S. standards, this Trade Act also requires agencies to consider international standards and, where appropriate, use them as the basis of U.S. standards. Fourth, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) requires agencies to prepare a written assessment of the costs, benefits, and other effects of proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate likely to result in the expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more annually (adjusted for inflation with the base year of 1995.)

In conducting these analyses, FAA has determined this rule (1) has benefits that justify its costs, is not a ''significant regulatory action'' as defined in section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and is not ''significant'' as defined in DOT's Regulatory Policies and Procedures; (2) will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities; (3) will not reduce barriers to international trade; and (4) does not impose an unfunded mandate on state, local, or tribal governments, or on the private sector. These analyses, available in the docket, are summarized below.

Introduction

This portion of the preamble summarizes the FAA's analysis of the economic impacts of a final rule amending part 25 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) to change the regulations applicable to transport category airplanes certificated for flight in icing conditions. It also includes summaries of the regulatory flexibility determination, the international trade impact assessment, and the unfunded mandates assessment. We suggest readers seeking greater detail read the full regulatory evaluation, a copy of which we have placed in the docket for this rulemaking.

Total Benefits and Costs of This Rulemaking

The estimated potential benefits of avoiding 3 accidents over the 45-year analysis interval are $89.2 million ($23.6 million in present value at seven percent). To obtain these benefits, over the 45-year analysis interval, manufacturers will incur additional certification costs of $9.8 million and the operators of these airplanes will pay $52.5 million in additional fuel-burn. We estimate the total cost of this final rule to be about $62.3 million and the seven percent present value cost of the rule will be about $23.0 million.

Who Is Potentially Affected by This Rulemaking

- Operators of part 25 U.S.-registered aircraft conducting operations under FAR Parts 121, 129, and 135, and
- Manufacturers of those part 25 aircraft.

Our Cost Assumptions and Sources of Information

This evaluation makes the following assumptions:

1. This final rule is assumed to become effective immediately.
2. The production runs for newly certificated part 25 airplane models is 20 years.
3. The average life of a part 25 airplane is 25 years.
4. We analyzed the costs and benefits of this final rule over the 45-year period (20 + 25 = 45) 2006 through 2050.
5. We used a 10-year certification compliance period. For the 10-year life-cycle period, the FAA calculated an average of four new certifications will occur.
6. We used $3.0 million as the value of an avoided fatality.
7. New airplane certifications will occur in year one of the analysis time period.

Benefits of This Rulemaking

The benefits of this final rule consist of the value of lives saved due to avoiding three accidents involving part 25 airplanes operating in icing conditions. Based on the historic accident rate, we estimate that a total of 12 fatalities could potentially be avoided by adopting the final rule. Over the 45-year period of analysis, the potential benefit of the propose rule will be $89.2 million ($23.6 million in present value at seven percent).

Costs of This Rulemaking

We estimate the costs of this final rule to be about $62.3 million ($23.0 million in present value at seven percent) over the 45-year analysis period. The total cost of $62.3 million equals the fixed certification costs of $9.8 million incurred in the first year plus the variable annual fuel burn cost of $52.5 million over the 45-year analysis period.

Regulatory Flexibility Determination

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–354) (RFA) establishes ''as a principle of regulatory issuance that agencies shall endeavor, consistent with the objectives of the rule and of applicable statutes, to fit regulatory and informational requirements to the scale of the businesses, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation. To achieve this principle, agencies are required to solicit and consider flexible regulatory proposals and to explain the rationale for their actions to assure that such proposals are given serious consideration.'' The RFA covers a wide-range of small entities, including small businesses, not-for-profit organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

Agencies must perform a review to determine whether a rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If the agency determines that it will, the agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis as described in the RFA.

However, if an agency determines that a rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, section 605(b) of the RFA provides that the head of the agency may so certify and a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required. The certification must include a statement providing the factual basis for this determination, and the reasoning should be clear.

In the interest of accuracy, one commenter requested we review the determination we made in the proposed rules regulatory flexibility evaluation. We reviewed the determination from the proposed rule and came to the same conclusions for this final rule for the reasons discussed below.

Currently U.S. manufactured part 25 aircraft type certificate holders include: The Boeing Company, Cessna Aircraft Company (a subsidiary of Textron Inc.), Raytheon Company, and Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation (a wholly owned subsidiary of General Dynamics). All United States part 25 aircraft manufacturers exceed the Small Business Administration small-entity criteria of 1,500 employees for aircraft manufacturers.

This rule will add an additional weighted average monthly fuel burn cost of about $42 per airplane, which is less than an hour of fuel burn and thus a minimal additional cost to all operators.

Given that manufacturers are not small entities and operators incur a minimal additional cost, as the FAA Administrator, I certify that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

International Trade Impact Assessment

The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96–39) prohibits Federal agencies from establishing any standards or engaging in related activities that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. Legitimate domestic objectives, such as safety, are not considered unnecessary obstacles. The statute also requires consideration of international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis for U.S. standards. The FAA has assessed the potential effect of this final rule and determined that it will impose the same costs on domestic and international entities and thus has a neutral trade impact.

Unfunded Mandates Assessment

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) requires each Federal agency to prepare a written statement assessing the effects of any Federal mandate in a proposed or final agency rule that may result in an expenditure of $100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation with the base year 1995) in any one year by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector; such a mandate is deemed to be a ''significant regulatory action.'' The FAA currently uses an inflation-adjusted value of $128.1 million in lieu of $100 million.

This final rule does not contain such a mandate. The requirements of Title II do not apply.

Executive Order 13132, Federalism

The FAA has analyzed this final rule under the principles and criteria of Executive Order 13132, Federalism. We determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, or the relationship between the national Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, and therefore does not have federalism implications.

Regulations Affecting Intrastate Aviation in Alaska

Section 1205 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3213) requires the FAA, when modifying its regulations in a manner affecting intrastate aviation in Alaska, to consider the extent to which Alaska is not served by transportation modes other than aviation, and to establish appropriate regulatory distinctions. In the NPRM, we requested comments on whether the proposed rule should apply differently to intrastate operations in Alaska. We didn't receive any comments, and we have determined, based on the administrative record of this rulemaking, that there is no need to make any regulatory distinctions applicable to intrastate aviation in Alaska.

Environmental Analysis

FAA Order 1050.1E identifies FAA actions that are categorically excluded from preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act in the absence of extraordinary circumstances. The FAA has determined this rulemaking action qualifies for the categorical exclusion identified in paragraph 312f and involves no extraordinary circumstances.

Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

The FAA has analyzed this final rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use (May 18, 2001). We have determined that it is not a ''significant energy action,'' and it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 25

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

The Amendment

■ In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 25 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 25—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRPLANES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 25 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701, 44702, and 44704.

■ 2. Amend § 25.21 by adding a new paragraph (g) to read as follows:

§ 25.21 Proof of compliance.

* * * * *

(g) The requirements of this subpart associated with icing conditions apply only if the applicant is seeking certification for flight in icing conditions.

(1) Each requirement of this subpart, except §§ 25.121(a), 25.123(c), 25.143(b)(1) and (b)(2), 25.149, 25.201(c)(2), 25.207(c) and (d), 25.239, and 25.251(b) through (e), must be met in icing conditions. Compliance must be shown using the ice accretions defined in appendix C, assuming normal operation of the airplane and its ice protection system in accordance with the operating limitations and operating procedures established by the applicant and provided in the Airplane Flight Manual.

(2) No changes in the load distribution limits of § 25.23, the weight limits of § 25.25 (except where limited by performance requirements of this subpart), and the center of gravity limits of § 25.27, from those for non-icing conditions, are allowed for flight in icing conditions or with ice accretion.

■ 3. Amend § 25.103 by revising paragraph (b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 25.103 Stall speed.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) The airplane in other respects (such as flaps, landing gear, and ice accretions) in the condition existing in the test or performance standard in which V_{SR} is being used;

* * * * *

■ 4. Amend § 25.105 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 25.105 Takeoff.

(a) The takeoff speeds prescribed by § 25.107, the accelerate-stop distance prescribed by § 25.109, the takeoff path prescribed by § 25.111, the takeoff distance and takeoff run prescribed by § 25.113, and the net takeoff flight path prescribed by § 25.115, must be determined in the selected configuration for takeoff at each weight, altitude, and ambient temperature within the operational limits selected by the applicant—

(1) In non-icing conditions; and

(2) In icing conditions, if in the configuration of § 25.121(b) with the takeoff ice accretion defined in appendix C:

(i) The stall speed at maximum takeoff weight exceeds that in non-icing conditions by more than the greater of 3 knots CAS or 3 percent of V_{SR}; or

(ii) The degradation of the gradient of climb determined in accordance with § 25.121(b) is greater than one-half of the applicable actual-to-net takeoff flight path gradient reduction defined in § 25.115(b).

* * * * *

■ 5. Amend § 25.107 by revising paragraph (c)(3) and (g)(2) and adding new paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 25.107 Takeoff speeds.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) A speed that provides the maneuvering capability specified in § 25.143(h).

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(2) A speed that provides the maneuvering capability specified in § 25.143(h).

(h) In determining the takeoff speeds V_1, V_R, and V_2 for flight in icing conditions, the values of V_{MCG}, V_{MC}, and V_{MU} determined for non-icing conditions may be used.

■ 6. Amend § 25.111 by revising paragraph (c)(3)(iii), (c)(4), and adding a new paragraph (c)(5) to read as follows:

§ 25.111 Takeoff path.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) * * *

(iii) 1.7 percent for four-engine airplanes.

(4) The airplane configuration may not be changed, except for gear retraction and automatic propeller feathering, and no change in power or thrust that requires action by the pilot may be made until the airplane is 400 feet above the takeoff surface; and

(5) If § 25.105(a)(2) requires the takeoff path to be determined for flight in icing conditions, the airborne part of the takeoff must be based on the airplane drag:

(i) With the takeoff ice accretion defined in appendix C, from a height of 35 feet above the takeoff surface up to the point where the airplane is 400 feet above the takeoff surface; and

(ii) With the final takeoff ice accretion defined in appendix C, from the point where the airplane is 400 feet above the takeoff surface to the end of the takeoff path.

* * * * *

■ 7. Revise § 25.119 to read as follows:

§ 25.119 Landing climb: All-engines-operating.

In the landing configuration, the steady gradient of climb may not be less than 3.2 percent, with the engines at the power or thrust that is available 8 seconds after initiation of movement of the power or thrust controls from the minimum flight idle to the go-around power or thrust setting—

(a) In non-icing conditions, with a climb speed of V_{REF} determined in accordance with § 25.125(b)(2)(i); and

(b) In icing conditions with the landing ice accretion defined in appendix C, and with a climb speed of V_{REF} determined in accordance with § 25.125(b)(2)(ii).

■ 8. Amend § 25.121 by revising paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) to read as follows:

§ 25.121 Climb: One-engine inoperative.

* * * * *

(b) *Takeoff; landing gear retracted.* In the takeoff configuration existing at the point of the flight path at which the landing gear is fully retracted, and in the configuration used in § 25.111 but without ground effect:

(1) The steady gradient of climb may not be less than 2.4 percent for two-engine airplanes, 2.7 percent for three-engine airplanes, and 3.0 percent for four-engine airplanes, at V_2 with:

(i) The critical engine inoperative, the remaining engines at the takeoff power or thrust available at the time the landing gear is fully retracted, determined under § 25.111, unless there is a more critical power operating condition existing later along the flight path but before the point where the airplane reaches a height of 400 feet above the takeoff surface; and

(ii) The weight equal to the weight existing when the airplane's landing gear is fully retracted, determined under § 25.111.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (b)(1) of this section must be met:

(i) In non-icing conditions; and

(ii) In icing conditions with the takeoff ice accretion defined in appendix C, if in the configuration of § 25.121(b) with the takeoff ice accretion:

(A) The stall speed at maximum takeoff weight exceeds that in non-icing conditions by more than the greater of 3 knots CAS or 3 percent of V_{SR}; or

(B) The degradation of the gradient of climb determined in accordance with § 25.121(b) is greater than one-half of the applicable actual-to-net takeoff flight path gradient reduction defined in § 25.115(b).

(c) *Final takeoff.* In the en route configuration at the end of the takeoff path determined in accordance with § 25.111:

(1) The steady gradient of climb may not be less than 1.2 percent for two-engine airplanes, 1.5 percent for three-engine airplanes, and 1.7 percent for four-engine airplanes, at V_{FTO} with—

(i) The critical engine inoperative and the remaining engines at the available maximum continuous power or thrust; and

(ii) The weight equal to the weight existing at the end of the takeoff path, determined under § 25.111.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (c)(1) of this section must be met:

(i) In non-icing conditions; and

(ii) In icing conditions with the final takeoff ice accretion defined in appendix C, if in the configuration of § 25.121(b) with the takeoff ice accretion:

(A) The stall speed at maximum takeoff weight exceeds that in non-icing conditions by more than the greater of 3 knots CAS or 3 percent of V_{SR}; or

(B) The degradation of the gradient of climb determined in accordance with § 25.121(b) is greater than one-half of the applicable actual-to-net takeoff flight path gradient reduction defined in § 25.115(b).

(d) *Approach.* In a configuration corresponding to the normal all-engines-operating procedure in which V_{SR} for this configuration does not exceed 110 percent of the V_{SR} for the related all-engines-operating landing configuration:

(1) The steady gradient of climb may not be less than 2.1 percent for two-engine airplanes, 2.4 percent for three-engine airplanes, and 2.7 percent for four-engine airplanes, with—

(i) The critical engine inoperative, the remaining engines at the go-around power or thrust setting;

(ii) The maximum landing weight;

(iii) A climb speed established in connection with normal landing procedures, but not exceeding 1.4 V_{SR}; and

(iv) Landing gear retracted.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (d)(1) of this section must be met:

(i) In non-icing conditions; and

(ii) In icing conditions with the approach ice accretion defined in appendix C. The climb speed selected for non-icing conditions may be used if the climb speed for icing conditions, computed in accordance with paragraph (d)(1)(iii) of this section, does not exceed that for non-icing conditions by more than the greater of 3 knots CAS or 3 percent.

■ 9. Amend § 25.123 by revising paragraph (a) introductory text and paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 25.123 En route flight paths.

(a) For the en route configuration, the flight paths prescribed in paragraph (b) and (c) of this section must be determined at each weight, altitude, and ambient temperature, within the operating limits established for the airplane. The variation of weight along the flight path, accounting for the progressive consumption of fuel and oil by the operating engines, may be included in the computation. The flight paths must be determined at a speed not less than V_{FTO}, with—

* * *

(b) The one-engine-inoperative net flight path data must represent the actual climb performance diminished by a gradient of climb of 1.1 percent for two-engine airplanes, 1.4 percent for three-engine airplanes, and 1.6 percent for four-engine airplanes—

(1) In non-icing conditions; and
(2) In icing conditions with the en route ice accretion defined in appendix C, if:
(i) A speed of 1.18 V_{SR} with the en route ice accretion exceeds the en route speed selected for non-icing conditions by more than the greater of 3 knots CAS or 3 percent of V_{SR}; or
(ii) The degradation of the gradient of climb is greater than one-half of the applicable actual-to-net flight path reduction defined in paragraph (b) of this section.

* * * * *

■ 10. Revise § 25.125 to read as follows:

§ 25.125 Landing.

(a) The horizontal distance necessary to land and to come to a complete stop (or to a speed of approximately 3 knots for water landings) from a point 50 feet above the landing surface must be determined (for standard temperatures, at each weight, altitude, and wind within the operational limits established by the applicant for the airplane):
(1) In non-icing conditions; and
(2) In icing conditions with the landing ice accretion defined in appendix C if V_{REF} for icing conditions exceeds V_{REF} for non-icing conditions by more than 5 knots CAS at the maximum landing weight.
(b) In determining the distance in paragraph (a) of this section:
(1) The airplane must be in the landing configuration.
(2) A stabilized approach, with a calibrated airspeed of not less than V_{REF}, must be maintained down to the 50-foot height.
(i) In non-icing conditions, V_{REF} may not be less than:
(A) 1.23 $V_{SR}0$;
(B) V_{MCL} established under § 25.149(f); and
(C) A speed that provides the maneuvering capability specified in § 25.143(h).
(ii) In icing conditions, V_{REF} may not be less than:
(A) The speed determined in paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section;
(B) 1.23 $V_{SR}0$ with the landing ice accretion defined in appendix C if that speed exceeds V_{REF} for non-icing conditions by more than 5 knots CAS; and
(C) A speed that provides the maneuvering capability specified in § 25.143(h) with the landing ice accretion defined in appendix C.
(3) Changes in configuration, power or thrust, and speed, must be made in accordance with the established procedures for service operation.
(4) The landing must be made without excessive vertical acceleration, tendency to bounce, nose over, ground loop, porpoise, or water loop.
(5) The landings may not require exceptional piloting skill or alertness.
(c) For landplanes and amphibians, the landing distance on land must be determined on a level, smooth, dry, hard-surfaced runway. In addition—
(1) The pressures on the wheel braking systems may not exceed those specified by the brake manufacturer;
(2) The brakes may not be used so as to cause excessive wear of brakes or tires; and
(3) Means other than wheel brakes may be used if that means—
(i) Is safe and reliable;
(ii) Is used so that consistent results can be expected in service; and
(iii) Is such that exceptional skill is not required to control the airplane.
(d) For seaplanes and amphibians, the landing distance on water must be determined on smooth water.
(e) For skiplanes, the landing distance on snow must be determined on smooth, dry, snow.
(f) The landing distance data must include correction factors for not more than 50 percent of the nominal wind components along the landing path opposite to the direction of landing, and not less than 150 percent of the nominal wind components along the landing path in the direction of landing.
(g) If any device is used that depends on the operation of any engine, and if the landing distance would be noticeably increased when a landing is made with that engine inoperative, the landing distance must be determined with that engine inoperative unless the use of compensating means will result in a landing distance not more than that with each engine operating.

■ 11. Amend § 25.143 by redesignating paragraphs (c) through (g) as paragraphs (d) through (h) respectively; adding a new paragraph (c); revising redesignated paragraphs (d), (e), and (f); amending redesignated paragraph (h) by removing the words ''Thrust power setting'' in the fourth column of the table and replacing them with the words ''Thrust/power setting''; and adding paragraphs (i), and (j) to read as follows:

§ 25.143 General.

* * * * *

(c) The airplane must be shown to be safely controllable and maneuverable with the critical ice accretion appropriate to the phase of flight defined in appendix C, and with the critical engine inoperative and its propeller (if applicable) in the minimum drag position:
(1) At the minimum V_2 for takeoff;
(2) During an approach and go-around; and
(3) During an approach and landing.
(d) The following table prescribes, for conventional wheel type controls, the maximum control forces permitted during the testing required by paragraph (a) through (c) of this section:

Force, in pounds, applied to the control wheel or rudder pedals	Pitch	Roll	Yaw
For short term application for pitch and roll control—two hands available for control	75	50	
For short term application for pitch and roll control—one hand available for control	50	25	
For short term application for yaw control			150
For long term application	10	5	20

(e) Approved operating procedures or conventional operating practices must be followed when demonstrating compliance with the control force limitations for short term application that are prescribed in paragraph (d) of this section. The airplane must be in trim, or as near to being in trim as practical, in the preceding steady flight condition. For the takeoff condition, the airplane must be trimmed according to the approved operating procedures.
(f) When demonstrating compliance with the control force limitations for long term application that are prescribed in paragraph (d) of this section, the airplane must be in trim, or as near to being in trim as practical.

* * * * *

(i) When demonstrating compliance with § 25.143 in icing conditions—
(1) Controllability must be demonstrated with the ice accretion defined in appendix C that is most critical for the particular flight phase;
(2) It must be shown that a push force is required throughout a pushover maneuver down to a zero g load factor, or the lowest load factor obtainable if limited by elevator power or other design characteristic of the flight control system. It must be possible to promptly recover from the maneuver without exceeding a pull control force of 50 pounds; and
(3) Any changes in force that the pilot must apply to the pitch control to

maintain speed with increasing sideslip angle must be steadily increasing with no force reversals, unless the change in control force is gradual and easily controllable by the pilot without using exceptional piloting skill, alertness, or strength.

(j) For flight in icing conditions before the ice protection system has been activated and is performing its intended function, the following requirements apply:

(1) If activating the ice protection system depends on the pilot seeing a specified ice accretion on a reference surface (not just the first indication of icing), the requirements of § 25.143 apply with the ice accretion defined in appendix C, part II(e).

(2) For other means of activating the ice protection system, it must be demonstrated in flight with the ice accretion defined in appendix C, part II(e) that:

(i) The airplane is controllable in a pull-up maneuver up to 1.5 g load factor; and

(ii) There is no pitch control force reversal during a pushover maneuver down to 0.5 g load factor.

■ 12. Amend § 25.207 by revising paragraph (b); redesignating paragraphs (e) and (f) as paragraphs (f) and (g) respectively; adding a new paragraph (e); revising redesignated paragraph (f) and adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 25.207 Stall warning.

* * * * *

(b) The warning must be furnished either through the inherent aerodynamic qualities of the airplane or by a device that will give clearly distinguishable indications under expected conditions of flight. However, a visual stall warning device that requires the attention of the crew within the cockpit is not acceptable by itself. If a warning device is used, it must provide a warning in each of the airplane configurations prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section at the speed prescribed in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section. Except for the stall warning prescribed in paragraph (h)(2)(ii) of this section, the stall warning for flight in icing conditions prescribed in paragraph (e) of this section must be provided by the same means as the stall warning for flight in non-icing conditions.

* * * * *

(e) In icing conditions, the stall warning margin in straight and turning flight must be sufficient to allow the pilot to prevent stalling (as defined in § 25.201(d)) when the pilot starts a recovery maneuver not less than three seconds after the onset of stall warning. When demonstrating compliance with this paragraph, the pilot must perform the recovery maneuver in the same way as for the airplane in non-icing conditions. Compliance with this requirement must be demonstrated in flight with the speed reduced at rates not exceeding one knot per second, with—

(1) The more critical of the takeoff ice and final takeoff ice accretions defined in appendix C for each configuration used in the takeoff phase of flight;

(2) The en route ice accretion defined in appendix C for the en route configuration;

(3) The holding ice accretion defined in appendix C for the holding configuration(s);

(4) The approach ice accretion defined in appendix C for the approach configuration(s); and

(5) The landing ice accretion defined in appendix C for the landing and go-around configuration(s).

(f) The stall warning margin must be sufficient in both non-icing and icing conditions to allow the pilot to prevent stalling when the pilot starts a recovery maneuver not less than one second after the onset of stall warning in slow-down turns with at least 1.5 g load factor normal to the flight path and airspeed deceleration rates of at least 2 knots per second. When demonstrating compliance with this paragraph for icing conditions, the pilot must perform the recovery maneuver in the same way as for the airplane in non-icing conditions. Compliance with this requirement must be demonstrated in flight with—

(1) The flaps and landing gear in any normal position;

(2) The airplane trimmed for straight flight at a speed of 1.3 V_{SR}; and

(3) The power or thrust necessary to maintain level flight at 1.3 V_{SR}.

* * * * *

(h) For flight in icing conditions before the ice protection system has been activated and is performing its intended function, the following requirements apply, with the ice accretion defined in appendix C, part II(e):

(1) If activating the ice protection system depends on the pilot seeing a specified ice accretion on a reference surface (not just the first indication of icing), the requirements of this section apply, except for paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

(2) For other means of activating the ice protection system, the stall warning margin in straight and turning flight must be sufficient to allow the pilot to prevent stalling without encountering any adverse flight characteristics when the speed is reduced at rates not exceeding one knot per second and the pilot performs the recovery maneuver in the same way as for flight in non-icing conditions.

(i) If stall warning is provided by the same means as for flight in non-icing conditions, the pilot may not start the recovery maneuver earlier than one second after the onset of stall warning.

(ii) If stall warning is provided by a different means than for flight in non-icing conditions, the pilot may not start the recovery maneuver earlier than 3 seconds after the onset of stall warning. Also, compliance must be shown with § 25.203 using the demonstration prescribed by § 25.201, except that the deceleration rates of § 25.201(c)(2) need not be demonstrated.

■ 13. Amend § 25.237 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 25.237 Wind velocities.

(a) For land planes and amphibians, the following applies:

(1) A 90-degree cross component of wind velocity, demonstrated to be safe for takeoff and landing, must be established for dry runways and must be at least 20 knots or 0.2 V_{SR0}, whichever is greater, except that it need not exceed 25 knots.

(2) The crosswind component for takeoff established without ice accretions is valid in icing conditions.

(3) The landing crosswind component must be established for:

(i) Non-icing conditions, and

(ii) Icing conditions with the landing ice accretion defined in appendix C.

* * * * *

■ 14. Amend § 25.253 by revising paragraph (b), and adding a new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 25.253 High-speed characteristics.

* * * * *

(b) *Maximum speed for stability characteristics.* V_{FC}/M_{FC}. V_{FC}/M_{FC} is the maximum speed at which the requirements of §§ 25.143(g), 25.147(E), 25.175(b)(1), 25.177, and 25.181 must be met with flaps and landing gear retracted. Except as noted in § 25.253(c), V_{FC}/M_{FC} may not be less than a speed midway between V_{MO}/M_{MO} and V_{DF}/M_{DF}, except that for altitudes where Mach number is the limiting factor, M_{FC} need not exceed the Mach number at which effective speed warning occurs.

(c) *Maximum speed for stability characteristics in icing conditions.* The maximum speed for stability characteristics with the ice accretions defined in appendix C, at which the requirements of §§ 25.143(g), 25.147(e), 25.175(b)(1), 25.177, and 25.181 must be met, is the lower of:

(1) 300 knots CAS;

(2) V_{FC}; or

(3) A speed at which it is demonstrated that the airframe will be free of ice accretion due to the effects of increased dynamic pressure.

■ 15. Amend § 25.773 by revising paragraph (b)(1)(ii) to read as follows:

§ 25.773 Pilot compartment view.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) * * *

(i) * * *

(ii) The icing conditions specified in § 25.1419 if certification for flight in icing conditions is requested.

* * * * *

■ 16. Amend § 25.941 by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 25.941 Inlet, engine, and exhaust compatibility.

* * * * *

(c) In showing compliance with paragraph (b) of this section, the pilot strength required may not exceed the limits set forth in § 25.143(d), subject to the conditions set forth in paragraphs (e) and (f) of § 25.143.

■ 17. Amend § 25.1419 by revising the introductory text to read as follows:

§ 25.1419 Ice protection.

If the applicant seeks certification for flight in icing conditions, the airplane must be able to safely operate in the continuous maximum and intermittent maximum icing conditions of appendix C. To establish this—

* * * * *

■ 18. Amend appendix C to part 25 by adding a part I heading and a new paragraph (c) to part I; and adding a new part II to read as follows:

Appendix C of Part 25

Part I—Atmospheric Icing Conditions

(a) * * *

(c) *Takeoff maximum icing.* The maximum intensity of atmospheric icing conditions for takeoff (takeoff maximum icing) is defined by the cloud liquid water content of 0.35 g/m3, the mean effective diameter of the cloud droplets of 20 microns, and the ambient air temperature at ground level of minus 9 degrees Celsius (-9(C). The takeoff maximum icing conditions extend from ground level to a height of 1,500 feet above the level of the takeoff surface.

Part II—Airframe Ice Accretions for Showing Compliance With Subpart B.

(a) *Ice accretions—General.* The most critical ice accretion in terms of airplane performance and handling qualities for each flight phase must be used to show compliance with the applicable airplane performance and handling requirements in icing conditions of subpart B of this part. Applicants must demonstrate that the full range of atmospheric icing conditions specified in part I of this appendix have been considered, including the mean effective drop diameter, liquid water content, and temperature appropriate to the flight conditions (for example, configuration, speed, angle-of-attack, and altitude). The ice accretions for each flight phase are defined as follows:

(1) *Takeoffice* is the most critical ice accretion on unprotected surfaces and any ice accretion on the protected surfaces appropriate to normal ice protection system operation, occurring between liftoff and 400 feet above the takeoff surface, assuming accretion starts at liftoff in the takeoff maximum icing conditions of part I, paragraph (c) of this appendix.

(2) *Final takeoff ice* is the most critical ice accretion on unprotected surfaces, and any ice accretion on the protected surfaces appropriate to normal ice protection system operation, between 400 feet and either 1,500 feet above the takeoff surface, or the height at which the transition from the takeoff to the en route configuration is completed and V_{FTO} is reached, whichever is higher. Ice accretion is assumed to start at liftoff in the takeoff maximum icing conditions of part I, paragraph (c) of this appendix.

(3) *En route ice* is the critical ice accretion on the unprotected surfaces, and any ice accretion on the protected surfaces appropriate to normal ice protection system operation, during the en route phase.

(4) *Holding ice* is the critical ice accretion on the unprotected surfaces, and any ice accretion on the protected surfaces appropriate to normal ice protection system operation, during the holding flight phase.

(5) *Approach ice* is the critical ice accretion on the unprotected surfaces, and any ice accretion on the protected surfaces appropriate to normal ice protection system operation following exit from the holding flight phase and transition to the most critical approach configuration.

(6) *Landing ice* is the critical ice accretion on the unprotected surfaces, and any ice accretion on the protected surfaces appropriate to normal ice protection system operation following exit from the approach flight phase and transition to the final landing configuration.

(b) In order to reduce the number of ice accretions to be considered when demonstrating compliance with the requirements of § 25.21(g), any of the ice accretions defined in paragraph (a) of this section may be used for any other flight phase if it is shown to be more critical than the specific ice accretion defined for that flight phase. Configuration differences and their effects on ice accretions must be taken into account.

(c) The ice accretion that has the most adverse effect on handling qualities may be used for airplane performance tests provided any difference in performance is conservatively taken into account.

(d) For both unprotected and protected parts, the ice accretion for the takeoff phase may be determined by calculation, assuming the takeoff maximum icing conditions defined in appendix C, and assuming that:

(1) Airfoils, control surfaces and, if applicable, propellers are free from frost, snow, or ice at the start of the takeoff;

(2) The ice accretion starts at liftoff;

(3) The critical ratio of thrust/power-to-weight;

(4) Failure of the critical engine occurs at V_{EF}; and

(5) Crew activation of the ice protection system is in accordance with a normal operating procedure provided in the Airplane Flight Manual, except that after beginning the takeoff roll, it must be assumed that the crew takes no action to activate the ice protection system until the airplane is at least 400 feet above the takeoff surface.

(e) The ice accretion before the ice protection system has been activated and is performing its intended function is the critical ice accretion formed on the unprotected and normally protected surfaces before activation and effective operation of the ice protection system in continuous maximum atmospheric icing conditions. This ice accretion only applies in showing compliance to §§ 25.143(j) and 25.207(h).

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 25, 2007.

Marion C. Blakey,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. E7–14937 Filed 8–7–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

copy of the framework document is available at: *http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance_standards/commercial/automatic_ice_making_equipment.html.*

Public meeting participants need not limit their comments to the issues identified in the framework document. DOE is also interested in comments on other relevant issues that participants believe would affect energy conservation standards for this equipment, applicable test procedures, or the preliminary determination of the scope of coverage. DOE invites all interested parties, whether or not they participate in the public meeting, to submit in writing by January 18, 2011, comments and information on matters addressed in the framework document and on other matters relevant to DOE's consideration of amended standards for automatic commercial ice-makers.

The public meeting will be conducted in an informal, facilitated, conference style. There shall be no discussion of proprietary information, costs or prices, market shares, or other commercial matters regulated by U.S. antitrust laws. A court reporter will record the proceedings of the public meeting, after which a transcript will be available for purchase from the court reporter and placed on the DOE Web site at: *http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance_standards/commercial/automatic_ice_making_equipment.html.*

After the public meeting and the close of the comment period on the framework document, DOE will begin conducting the analyses as discussed in the framework document and at the public meeting, and reviewing the public comments.

DOE considers public participation to be a very important part of the process for determining whether to amend energy conservation standards, as well as for setting those amended standards. DOE actively encourages the participation and interaction of the public during the comment period in each stage of the rulemaking process. Beginning with the framework document, and during each subsequent public meeting and comment period, interactions with and among members of the public provide a balanced discussion of the issues to assist DOE in the standards rulemaking process. Accordingly, anyone who wishes to participate in the public meeting, receive meeting materials, or be added to the DOE mailing list to receive future notices and information about this rulemaking should contact Ms. Brenda Edwards at (202) 586–2945, or via e-mail at *Brenda.Edwards@ee.doe.gov.*

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 4, 2010.

Cathy Zoi,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 2010–29208 Filed 11–18–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 25

[Docket No. FAA–2010–0310; Notice No. 10–17]

RIN 2120–AJ72

Harmonization of Various Airworthiness Standards for Transport Category Airplanes—Flight Rules

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to amend various airworthiness standards for transport category airplanes. This action would harmonize the requirements for takeoff speeds, static lateral-directional stability, speed increase and recovery characteristics, and the stall warning margin for the landing configuration in icing conditions with the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) certification standards. When airplanes are type certificated to both sets of standards, differences between the standards can result in additional costs to manufacturers and operators. Adopting this proposal would harmonize regulatory differences for the items noted above between United States (U.S.) and EASA airworthiness standards.

DATES: Send your comments on or before February 17, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments identified by Docket Number FAA–2010–0310 using any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- *Mail:* Send comments to Docket Operations, M–30; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Room W12–140, West Building Ground Floor, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* Take comments to Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Fax:* Fax comments to Docket Operations at 202–493–2251.

For more information on the rulemaking process, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

Privacy: We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information you provide. Using the search function of our docket web site, anyone can find and read the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets, including the name of the individual sending the comment (or signing the comment for an association, business, labor union, *etc.*). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit *http://DocketsInfo.dot.gov.*

Docket: To read background documents or comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* at any time and follow the online instructions for accessing the docket, or go to the Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical questions concerning this proposed rule contact Don Stimson, FAA, Airplane & Flight Crew Interface Branch, ANM–111, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98057–3356; telephone (425) 227–1129; facsimile (425) 227–1149, e-mail *Don.Stimson@faa.gov.*

For legal questions about this proposed rule, contact Doug Anderson, FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel (ANM–7), 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98057–3356; telephone (425) 227–2166; facsimile (425) 227–1007; e-mail *Douglas.Anderson@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Later in this preamble, under the Additional Information section, we discuss how you can comment on this proposal and how we will handle your comments. Included in this discussion is related information about the docket, privacy, and the handling of proprietary or confidential business information. We also discuss how you can get a copy of this proposal and related rulemaking documents. Appendix 1 of this NPRM defines terms used in this proposal.

Authority for This Rulemaking

The FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety is found in Title 49 of the United States Code. Subtitle I, Section 106 describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the agency's authority.

This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, part A, subpart III, section 44701, "General requirements." Under that section, the FAA is charged with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations and minimum standards for the design and performance of aircraft that the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority. It prescribes new safety standards for the design and operation of transport category airplanes.

Background

Part 25 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) prescribes airworthiness standards for type certification of transport category airplanes for products certified in the United States. EASA's Certification Specifications for Large Aeroplanes (CS–25) prescribe the corresponding airworthiness standards for products certified in Europe by the European Aviation Safety Agency. While part 25 and CS–25 are similar, they differ in several respects.

The FAA tasked the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) through its Flight Test Harmonization Working Group to review existing regulations and recommend changes that would eliminate differences between the U.S. and European performance and handling characteristics standards by harmonizing to the higher standards. This proposed rule is a result of this harmonization effort.

General Discussion of the Proposal

Three of the four changes to the part 25 airworthiness requirements proposed in this rulemaking respond to ARAC recommendations and EASA's actions in response to those recommendations. The fourth proposed change (pertaining to the stall warning margin for the landing configuration in icing conditions) responds to an action taken by EASA regarding a comment made during the public comment period of the harmonized rulemaking that led to adoption of Amendment 25–121 and Amendment 3 of CS–25.

The FAA agrees with the actions taken by EASA and proposes to amend part 25 in a similar manner. The proposals are not expected to be controversial and should reduce costs to industry without adversely affecting safety. In developing these proposals, ARAC and the FAA considered the following factors:

a. Underlying safety issues addressed by current standards;

b. Differences between part 25 and CS–25 standards;

c. Differences between part 25 and CS–25 means of compliance;

e. Effect of the proposed standard on current industry practice;

f. Whether FAA advisory material exists and/or needs amendment; and

g. The costs and benefits of each proposal.

The complete analyses for the proposed changes made in response to ARAC recommendations can be found in the ARAC recommendation reports. We have placed the reports in the docket for this rulemaking.

The appendix of this preamble contains a glossary of airspeed terms and definitions to help the reader understand the rulemaking proposals.

Proposals From ARAC Recommendations

The following proposals result from ARAC recommendations made to the FAA and EASA:

(1) Amend § 25.107(e)(1)(iv), selection of the takeoff rotation speed;

(2) Amend § 25.177, static lateral-directional stability; and

(3) Amend § 25.253, roll capability and extension of speedbrakes at high speeds.

EASA's rulemaking action in response to these recommendations was included in the original issuance of CS–25, effective October 17, 2003. The adopted CS–25 requirements differ somewhat from the ARAC recommendations due to public comments received during the rulemaking process and because EASA disagreed with some portions of ARAC's recommendations.

A Proposal From a Commenter

The sole proposal that did not result from an ARAC recommendation is to amend § 25.21(g)(1) to add stall warning requirements that must be met in the landing configuration for flight in icing conditions. This proposal originates from a comment that this requirement should be added, which was made during the public comment period of the rulemaking that led to adoption of Amendment 25–121, Airplane Performance and Handling Qualities in Icing Conditions.

In the preamble to that rulemaking (72 FR 44665), the FAA stated that we needed more time and aviation industry participation to fully address the safety concern expressed in this comment. We were concerned that adopting the changes proposed by the commenter would introduce significant regulatory differences from EASA's airworthiness certification requirements, and potentially add significant costs (as an initial cost estimate indicated). Further, it was unclear whether the proposed changes would completely resolve the potential safety issue.

The commenter made the same comment to EASA during the public comment period for the rulemaking that became Amendment 3 to CS–25, which corresponds to Amendment 25–121 of 14 CFR. EASA deferred addressing the comment until its Notice of Proposed Amendment 2008–05, dated April 10, 2008. EASA did not receive any opposing comments from the public and adopted the rule change in Amendment 6 to CS–25, issued July 6, 2009. The FAA proposes to amend § 25.21(g) in the same manner.

Discussion of the Proposed Regulatory Requirements

Proof of Compliance—§ 25.21(g)(1)

Section 25.21(g)(1) specifies which subpart B requirements must be met in icing conditions and the ice accretions that must be used to show compliance. The current rule does not require the stall warning margin requirements of § 25.207(c) and (d) to be met in icing conditions. The proposed rule would require that these stall warning margin requirements be met in icing conditions for the landing configuration. This proposed change would harmonize our standards with CS 25.21(g)(1), except for one minor difference regarding seaplanes and amphibians. This is because part 25 contains requirements for seaplanes and amphibians, and CS–25 does not.

Takeoff Speeds—§ 25.107(e)(1)(iv)

This requirement ensures that the scheduled takeoff speeds provide a minimum liftoff speed (V_{LOF}) greater than the minimum safe flyaway speed (V_{MU}). The V_{MU} is the lowest speed at which an applicant demonstrates that no hazardous characteristics are present, such as a relatively high drag condition or a stall. This rule prescribes a minimum speed margin between V_{LOF} and V_{MU} to ensure a safe takeoff speed, while taking likely in-service variations in takeoff technique into consideration.

The FAA proposes to allow reduction of both the all-engines-operating and one-engine-inoperative speed margins between V_{MU} and V_{LOF} for airplanes for which the minimum liftoff speed is limited by the geometry of the airplane (i.e., ground contact of the tail of the airframe with the runway as the nose lifts off). This limiting condition provides protection against early or over-rotation beyond the safe liftoff pitch attitude at or near V_{MU} such that the prescribed minimum speed margin can be reduced without reducing the level of safety. In the past, the FAA has allowed reduction of this speed margin for geometry-limited airplanes for the all-engines-operating condition using findings of equivalent safety. The proposed standard would codify this practice and extend its application to the one-engine-inoperative condition. This proposed change would harmonize this takeoff speed requirement with CS 25.107(e)(1)(iv).

Static Lateral-Directional Stability—§ 25.177

This requirement ensures that transport category airplanes have basic lateral and directional stability, proportionality between aileron and rudder control movements and forces (at least within the sideslip angles appropriate to the operation of the airplane), and freedom from fin stall or rudder overbalance. The full rudder sideslip requirements of § 25.177(c) are primarily intended to investigate the potential for a loss of directional stability or fin stall (as indicated by a decrease in the rudder deflection needed for increased angles of sideslip) and rudder overbalance or locking (as indicated by a reversal in the rudder pedal force).

The proposed revision to § 25.177(a) and (b) would reinstate the standards that existed prior to Amendment 25–72 that treat the specific lateral and directional stability requirements as separate entities.

The proposed revisions to § 25.177(c) are as follows:

1. Divide the existing paragraph into two separate paragraphs. The proposed § 25.177(c) would address the basic lateral and directional stability, while a new paragraph (d) would be introduced to address full rudder sideslips. The existing paragraph (d) would be removed as its provisions would be covered by the reinstated § 25.177(b).

2. Revise § 25.177(c) to require that proportionality criteria must also be met at the sideslip angles obtained with one-half of the available rudder control (i.e., rudder pedal input). This change would impose a minimum lateral control power requirement such that the airplane must be capable of maintaining a straight, steady, sideslip when the pilot puts in one-half of the available rudder control or uses a force of 180 pounds on the rudder control at the conditions specified in the rule.

3. Specify that the requirements in § 25.177(c) must be met for the configurations and speeds specified in § 25.177(a). This proposal would not change the applicable conditions from those applied in practice under the current § 25.177(c).

4. Move the current § 25.177(c) requirement that applies to sideslip angles greater than those considered appropriate for normal operation of the airplane (i.e., up to full rudder control input) to a proposed new § 25.177(d). The conditions for which this requirement must be met would include all of the approved landing gear and flap positions for the range of operating speeds and power conditions appropriate to each landing gear and flap position with all engines operating. Relative to the current § 25.177(c), this proposal would reduce the range of speeds and power settings for which the requirement applies. The reduced speed ranges specified in the proposed § 25.177(d) are intended to reduce the flight test safety risk as well as to harmonize and standardize current practices.

5. Add text to the new § 25.177(d) stating that compliance with this requirement must be shown using straight, steady sideslips, unless full lateral control input is achieved before reaching either the rudder control input or force limit. A straight, steady sideslip need not be maintained beyond the lateral control limit. This change further clarifies the intent of the requirement regarding the capability required beyond the sideslip angles considered appropriate for operations. For airplanes lacking sufficient aileron control power to maintain a steady heading with full rudder input, any flight test demonstration would be continued to full rudder input even though a steady heading could not be maintained. This situation has caused difficulties in the past because the current rule wording is ambiguous regarding the conduct of the full rudder sideslips. This proposal would codify the FAA interpretation provided in the preamble to Amendment 25–72, Special Review: Transport Category Airplane Airworthiness Standards (55 FR 29756).

Also, § 25.253(b) and (c) would be revised to reference only § 25.177 (a) through (c), rather than the entire § 25.177, to be consistent with the proposed reduced speed range over which § 25.177(d) applies. The current § 25.253 (b) and (c) specify that V_{FC}/M_{FC} is the maximum speed for which the requirements of all of § 25.177 must be met. Because the proposed § 25.177(d) requirements only apply to the operational speed range (e.g., V_{MO}/M_{MO}) and need not be met at V_{FC}/M_{FC}, the reference to § 25.177 in § 25.253(b) and (c) would be revised to refer only to § 25.177(a) through (c).

These proposed changes would harmonize the static lateral-directional stability requirements with the corresponding CS–25 requirements and update references to these requirements in other sections of part 25.

High-Speed Characteristics—§ 25.253

This requirement assures that the airplane has safe recovery characteristics at speeds beyond the maximum operating limit speed (V_{MO}/M_{MO}) up to the maximum demonstrated flight diving speed (V_{DF}/M_{DF}). We propose to add requirements that (1) there must be adequate roll capability to assure a prompt recovery from a lateral upset condition and (2) speedbrake extension at high speed must not result in an excessive positive load factor when the pilot does act to counteract the effects of the extension. The speedbrake extension at high speed also must not cause buffeting that would impair the pilot's ability to read the instruments or cause a nose-down pitching moment, unless that pitching moment is small.

The proposed revision would harmonize our high-speed characteristics requirements with CS 25.253.

Advisory Material

The FAA is revising AC 25–7 to incorporate guidance on how to comply with the proposed harmonized standards. The draft AC is posted on the FAA's draft document Web site at *http://www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft_docs/.*

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507(d)) requires that the FAA consider the impact of paperwork and other information collection burdens imposed on the public. The FAA has determined that there would be no new requirement for information collection associated with this proposed rule.

International Compatibility

In keeping with U.S. obligations under the Convention on International Civil Aviation, it is FAA policy to conform to International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Standards and Recommended Practices to the maximum extent practicable. The FAA has reviewed the corresponding ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices and has identified no differences with these proposed regulations.

Regulatory Evaluation, Regulatory Flexibility Determination, International Trade Impact Assessment, and Unfunded Mandates Assessment

Changes to Federal regulations must undergo several economic analyses. First, Executive Order 12866 directs that each Federal agency shall propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs. Second, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–354) requires agencies to analyze the economic impact of regulatory changes on small entities. Third, the Trade Agreements Act (Pub. L. 96–39) prohibits agencies from setting standards that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. In developing U.S. standards, this Trade Act requires agencies to consider international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis of U.S. standards. Fourth, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) requires agencies to prepare a written assessment of the costs, benefits, and other effects of proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate likely to result in the expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more annually (adjusted for inflation with base year of 1995). This portion of the preamble summarizes the FAA's analysis of the economic impact of the proposed rule.

Department of Transportation Order DOT 2100.5 prescribes policies and procedures for simplification, analysis, and review of regulations. If the expected cost impact is so minimal that a proposed or final rule does not warrant a full evaluation, this order permits that a statement to that effect and the basis for it be included in the preamble if a full regulatory evaluation of the costs and benefits is not prepared. Such a determination has been made for this proposed rule.

The reasoning for this determination follows: The proposed rule would amend §§ 25.21(g)(1), 25.107(e)(1)(iv), 25.177, and 25.253 to harmonize with EASA requirements already in CS–25. A review of current practice of U.S. manufacturers of transport category airplanes has revealed the manufacturers intend to fully comply with the EASA standards (or are already complying) as a means of obtaining joint certification. Since future certificated transport category airplanes are expected to meet the existing CS–25 requirements and this proposed rule would simply adopt the same requirements, the manufacturers would incur no additional costs. The proposed rule would provide benefits from reduced joint certification costs from the harmonization itself, and for the parts of the rule harmonizing with less stringent EASA requirements; manufacturers can expect additional benefits inherent in the reduced stringency. The FAA therefore has determined that this proposed rule would have no costs and positive benefits and does not warrant a full regulatory evaluation. The FAA requests comments regarding this determination. We discuss the basis for our findings below.

The FAA has also determined that this proposed rule is not a "significant regulatory action" as defined in section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, and is not "significant" as defined in DOT's Regulatory Policies and Procedures.

Costs and Benefits of This Rulemaking

Cost and Benefits of Proposed Amendment to § 25.21(g)(1)

We are proposing to adopt an EASA requirement that has no counterpart in the current CFR. Manufacturer compliance with the EASA requirement would increase the safety of their airplanes. Since the manufacturers intend to comply with the EASA requirement, however, there would be no additional safety benefits from compliance with the proposed harmonizing amendment. Nevertheless, it is beneficial to make the FAA's compliance requirement identical to EASA's requirement in order to avoid confusion and make clear that the safety implications of the proposed § 25.21(g)(1) and CS 25.21(g)(1) are identical.

As we are proposing to adopt an EASA requirement that has no counterpart in the current CFR, there can be no reduction in certification costs—in the requirements for data collection and analysis, paperwork, and time spent applying for and obtaining approval from the regulatory authorities. Rather, manufacturers would face some increase in certification costs to comply with the EASA requirement. Since the manufacturers intend to comply with the EASA requirement, however, they would incur no additional costs to comply with the proposed FAA harmonizing amendment.

Costs and Benefits of Proposed Amendment to § 25.107(e)(1)(iv)

Manufacturers would benefit as a result of reduced certification costs from the harmonization of proposed § 25.107(e)(1)(iv) with CS 25.107(e)(1)(iv).

Additional benefits would result because the proposed amendment is a less stringent requirement, which would reduce the required minimum takeoff speed of geometry-limited (viz., tail contact with the runway) airplanes. As discussed in the preamble above, since the minimum takeoff speed is, in part, intended to reduce the probability of an airplane reaching a takeoff pitch attitude beyond that shown to be safe, the additional protection against such a condition inherent in a geometry-limited airplane allows the minimum takeoff speed to be safely reduced. The less stringent requirement implies higher takeoff weights, increases in payload, and shorter takeoff distances for geometry-limited airplanes. These are operator benefits, some of which will accrue to part 25 manufacturers by increasing airplane value.

As this proposed amendment is relieving, there would be no increase in costs.

Costs and Benefits of Proposed Amendment to § 25.177

Section 25.177(a) and (b) (requiring separate directional and lateral stability assessments) were removed by Amendment 25–72, published in the **Federal Register** (55 FR 29756), July 20, 1990. The FAA considered them unnecessary since directional and lateral stability could be determined using an "alternative test" based on data obtained in showing compliance with § 25.177(c). EASA's retention of CS 25.177(a) and (b), however, allows manufacturers to use the "basic test" outlined by CS 25.177(a) and (b). Reinstatement of § 25.177(a) and (b) would lower certification costs for manufacturers preferring instead to use the "basic test." Part 25 manufacturers preferring to satisfy the stability requirements with the "alternative test" of § 25.177(c) would face no increase in cost since they could still use that test. In any case, since manufacturers intend to comply with CS 25.177(a) and (b), they would incur no additional costs from complying with the proposed harmonizing amendment regardless of the cost situation.

Compared to the current § 25.177(c) and (d), CS 25.177(c) and (d) have both more stringent and less stringent requirements. As discussed in the preamble above, the less stringent requirement would increase the safety of flight tests without reducing test validity. Compliance with the more stringent requirement would entail some certification costs and reduce payload-carrying capability under certain conditions. Since the manufacturers intend to comply with CS 25.177(c) and (d), however, they would incur no additional costs to comply with the proposed harmonizing amendment.

Costs and Benefits of Proposed Amendment to § 25.253

Manufacturers would benefit as a result of reduced certification costs from the harmonization of § 25.253 with CS 25.253. The compliance of the manufacturers with the more stringent EASA requirements would also increase the safety of their airplanes. Since the manufacturers intend to comply with the EASA requirements, however, there would be no additional safety benefits from compliance with the proposed FAA harmonizing amendment.

Part 25 manufacturers would face additional certification costs, especially additional flight testing costs, to meet the EASA requirements. Since the manufacturers intend to comply with the EASA requirements, however, they would incur no additional costs to comply with the proposed FAA harmonizing amendment.

Summary of Costs and Benefits

The benefits of an FAA rule harmonizing with a more stringent EASA rule necessarily flow from reduced certification costs brought about by the harmonization itself. Just as any costs are attributable to complying with the existing EASA rule, so too are any benefits from increased safety. Accordingly, the benefits of the more stringent §§ 25.21(g)(1), 25.253, 25.177(a) and (b), and the more stringent parts of § 25.177(c) and (d) would be reduced certification costs or qualitative benefits from harmonization.

For an FAA rule harmonizing with a less stringent EASA rule, there would be reduced certification costs from the harmonization itself, but also benefits inherent in the reduced stringency. For § 25.107(e)(1)(iv) the inherent benefits to operators would be higher takeoff weights, increases in payload, and shorter takeoff distances for geometry-limited airplanes allowed by the reduced minimum takeoff speeds. For the reduced speed ranges specified in proposed § 25.177(c) and (d), the inherent benefits would be to reduce test flight safety risk.

The FAA, therefore, has determined that this proposed rule would have minimal costs with positive net benefits and does not warrant a full regulatory evaluation. The FAA requests comments regarding our determination of minimal costs with positive net benefits.

Regulatory Flexibility Determination

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–354) (RFA) establishes "as a principle of regulatory issuance that agencies shall endeavor, consistent with the objectives of the rule and of applicable statutes, to fit regulatory and informational requirements to the scale of the businesses, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation. To achieve this principle, agencies are required to solicit and consider flexible regulatory proposals and to explain the rationale for their actions to assure that such proposals are given serious consideration." The RFA covers a wide-range of small entities, including small businesses, not-for-profit organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

Agencies must perform a review to determine whether a rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If the agency determines that it will, the agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis as described in the RFA. However, if an agency determines that a rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, section 605(b) of the RFA provides that the head of the agency may so certify and a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required. The certification must include a statement providing the factual basis for this determination, and the reasoning should be clear.

As noted above, this proposed rule would not entail any additional costs to part 25 manufacturers as they are already in compliance, or intend to fully comply, with more stringent EASA standards. Moreover, all U.S. manufacturers of transport category airplanes exceed the Small Business Administration small-entity criteria of 1,500 employees. Therefore, the FAA certifies that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The FAA requests comments regarding this determination.

International Trade Impact Assessment

The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96–39), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (Pub. L. 103–465), prohibits Federal agencies from establishing standards or engaging in related activities that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. Pursuant to these Acts, the establishment of standards is not considered an unnecessary obstacle to the foreign commerce of the United States, so long as the standard has a legitimate domestic objective, such the protection of safety, and does not operate in a manner that excludes imports that meet this objective. The statute also requires consideration of international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis for U.S. standards. The FAA has assessed the potential effect of this proposed rule and determined that it would promote international trade by harmonizing with corresponding EASA regulations thus reducing the cost of joint certification.

Unfunded Mandates Assessment

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) requires each Federal agency to prepare a written statement assessing the effects of any Federal mandate in a proposed or final agency rule that may result in an expenditure of $100 million or more (in 1995 dollars) in any one year by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector; such a mandate is deemed to be a "significant regulatory action." The FAA currently uses an inflation-adjusted value of $136.1 million in lieu of $100 million.

This proposed rule does not contain such a mandate. The requirements of Title II do not apply.

Executive Order 13132, Federalism

The FAA has analyzed this proposed rule and the principles and criteria of Executive Order 13132, Federalism. We determined that this action 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 and therefore, would not have federalism implications.

Environmental Analysis

FAA Order 1050.1E identifies FAA actions that are categorically excluded from preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act in the absence of extraordinary circumstances. The FAA has determined this proposed rulemaking action qualifies for the categorical exclusion identified in paragraph 312d and involves no extraordinary circumstances.

Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

The FAA has analyzed this NPRM under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use (May 18, 2001). We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under the executive order, it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and DOT’s Regulatory Policies and Procedures, and it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy.

Regulations Affecting Intrastate Aviation in Alaska

Section 1205 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3213) requires the Administrator, when modifying regulations in Title 14 of the CFR in a manner affecting intrastate aviation in Alaska, to consider the extent to which Alaska is not served by transportation modes other than aviation, and to establish such regulatory distinctions as he or she considers appropriate. Because this proposed rule would apply to the certification of future designs of transport category airplanes and their subsequent operation, it could, if adopted, affect intrastate aviation in Alaska. The FAA therefore specifically requests comments on whether there is justification for applying the proposed rule differently to intrastate operations in Alaska.

Plain English

Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993) requires each agency to write regulations that are simple and easy to understand. We invite your comments on how to make these proposed regulations easier to understand, including answers to questions such as the following:

- Are the requirements in the proposed regulations clearly stated?
- Do the proposed regulations contain unnecessary technical language or jargon that interferes with their clarity?
- Would the regulations be easier to understand if they were divided into more (but shorter) sections?
- Is the description in the preamble helpful in understanding the proposed regulations?

Please send your comments to the address specified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Additional Information

Comments Invited

The FAA invites interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written comments, data, or views. We also invite comments relating to the economic, environmental, energy, or federalism impacts that might result from adopting the proposals in this document. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the proposal, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. To ensure that the docket does not contain duplicate comments, please send only one copy of written comments, or if you are filing comments electronically, please submit your comments only one time.

We will file in the docket all comments we receive, as well as a report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposed rulemaking. Before acting on this proposal, we will consider all comments we receive on or before the closing date for comments. We will consider comments filed after the comment period has closed if it is possible to do so without incurring expense or delay. We may change this proposal because of the comments we receive.

Proprietary or Confidential Business Information

Do not file in the docket information that you consider to be proprietary or confidential business information. Send or deliver such information directly to the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document. You must mark the information that you consider proprietary or confidential. If you send the information on a disk or CD–ROM, mark the outside of the disk or CD–ROM and also identify electronically within the disk or CD–ROM the specific information that is proprietary or confidential.

Under § 11.35(b), when we are aware of proprietary information filed with a comment, we do not place it in the docket. We hold it in a separate file to which the public does not have access, and we place a note in the docket that we have received it. If we receive a request to examine or copy this information, we treat it as any other request under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). We process such a request under the DOT procedures found in 49 CFR part 7.

Availability of Rulemaking Documents

You can get an electronic copy of rulemaking documents using the Internet by—

1. Searching the Federal eRulemaking Portal (*http://www.regulations.gov*);
2. Visiting the FAA’s Regulations and Policies Web page at *http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/;* or
3. Accessing the Government Printing Office’s web page at *http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.html.*

You can also get a copy by sending a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, ARM–1, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–9680. Make sure to identify the docket number or notice number of this rulemaking.

You may access all documents the FAA considered in developing this proposed rule, including economic analyses and technical reports, from the Internet through the Federal eRulemaking Portal referenced in paragraph (1).

Appendix 1 to the Preamble

SPEED TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Term	Definition
V_R	Rotation speed.
V_1	Maximum speed in the takeoff at which the pilot must take the first action (*e.g.,* apply brakes, reduce thrust, deploy speed brakes) to stop the airplane within the accelerate stop distance. It also means the minimum speed in the takeoff, following a failure of the critical engine at V_{EF}, at which the pilot can continue the takeoff and achieve the required height above the takeoff surface within the takeoff distance.
V_2	Takeoff safety speed.
V_{REF}	Reference landing speed.
V_{SW}	Speed at which the onset of natural or artificial stall warning occurs.
V_{SR}	Reference stall speed.
V_{SR1}	Reference stall speed in a specific configuration.
V_{LOF}	Lift-off speed.
V_{MU}	Minimum unstick speed.
V_{MC}	Minimum control speed with the critical engine inoperative.
V_{FE}	Maximum flap extended speed.
V_{LE}	Maximum landing gear extended speed.

SPEED TERMS AND DEFINITIONS—Continued

Term	Definition
V_{FC}/M_{FC}	Maximum speed for stability characteristics.
V_{MO}/M_{MO}	Maximum operating limit speed.
V_{DF}/M_{DF}	Demonstrated flight diving speed.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 25

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 25 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 25—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRPLANES

1. The authority citation for part 25 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701, 44702 and 44704.

2. Amend § 25.21 by revising paragraph (g)(1) to read as follows:

§ 25.21 Proof of compliance.

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(1) Each requirement of this subpart, except §§ 25.121(a), 25.123(c), 25.143(b)(1) and (b)(2), 25.149, 25.201(c)(2), 25.239, and 25.251(b) through (e), must be met in icing conditions. Section 25.207(c) and (d) must be met in the landing configuration in icing conditions, but need not be met for other configurations. Compliance must be shown using the ice accretions defined in appendix C of this part, assuming normal operation of the airplane and its ice protection system in accordance with the operating limitations and operating procedures established by the applicant and provided in the Airplane Flight Manual.

* * * * *

3. Amend § 25.107 by revising paragraph (e)(1)(iv) to read as follows:

§ 25.107 Takeoff speeds.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(1) * * *

(iv) A speed that, if the airplane is rotated at its maximum practicable rate, will result in a V_{LOF} of not less than—

(A) 110 percent of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition, and 105 percent of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition; or

(B) If the V_{MU} attitude is limited by the geometry of the airplane (i.e., tail contact with the runway), 108 percent of V_{MU} in the all-engines-operating condition and 104 percent of V_{MU} determined at the thrust-to-weight ratio corresponding to the one-engine-inoperative condition.

* * * * *

4. Revise § 25.177 to read as follows:

§ 25.177 Static lateral-directional stability.

(a) The static directional stability (as shown by the tendency to recover from a skid with the rudder free) must be positive for any landing gear and flap position and symmetric power condition, at speeds from 1.13 V_{SR1}, up to V_{FE}, V_{LE}, or V_{FC}/M_{FC} (as appropriate).

(b) The static lateral stability (as shown by the tendency to raise the low wing in a sideslip with the aileron controls free) for any landing gear and flap position and symmetric power condition, may not be negative at any airspeed (except that speeds higher than V_{FE} need not be considered for flaps extended configurations nor speeds higher than V_{LE} for landing gear extended configurations) in the following airspeed ranges:

(1) From 1.13 V_{SR1} to V_{MO}/M_{MO}.

(2) From V_{MO}/M_{MO} to V_{FC}/M_{FC}, unless the divergence is—

(i) Gradual;

(ii) Easily recognizable by the pilot; and

(iii) Easily controllable by the pilot.

(c) In straight, steady sideslips over the range of sideslip angles appropriate to the operation of the airplane, but not less than those obtained with one-half of the available rudder control input or a rudder control force of 180 pounds, the aileron and rudder control movements and forces must be substantially proportional to the angle of sideslip in a stable sense; and the factor of proportionality must lie between limits found necessary for safe operation. This requirement must be met for the configurations and speeds specified in paragraph (a) of this section.

(d) For sideslip angles greater than those prescribed by paragraph (c) of this section, up to the angle at which full rudder control is used or a rudder control force of 180 pounds is obtained, the rudder control forces may not reverse, and increased rudder deflection must be needed for increased angles of sideslip. Compliance with this requirement must be shown using straight, steady sideslips, unless full lateral control input is achieved before reaching either full rudder control input or a rudder control force of 180 pounds; a straight, steady sideslip need not be maintained after achieving full lateral control input. This requirement must be met at all approved landing gear and flap positions for the range of operating speeds and power conditions appropriate to each landing gear and flap position with all engines operating.

5. Amend § 25.253 by adding paragraphs (a)(4) and (a)(5) and revising paragraphs (b) and (c) introductory text to read as follows:

§ 25.253 High-speed characteristics.

(a) * * *

(4) Adequate roll capability to assure a prompt recovery from a lateral upset condition must be available at any speed up to V_{DF}/M_{DF}.

(5) With the airplane trimmed at V_{MO}/M_{MO}, extension of the speedbrakes over the available range of movements of the pilot's control, at all speeds above V_{MO}/M_{MO}, but not so high that V_{DF}/M_{DF} would be exceeded during the maneuver, must not result in:

(i) An excessive positive load factor when the pilot does not take action to counteract the effects of extension;

(ii) Buffeting that would impair the pilot's ability to read the instruments or control the airplane for recovery; or

(iii) A nose down pitching moment, unless it is small.

(b) *Maximum speed for stability characteristics, V_{FC}/M_{FC}.* V_{FC}/M_{FC} is the maximum speed at which the requirements of §§ 25.143(g), 25.147(e), 25.175(b)(1), 25.177(a) through (c), and 25.181 must be met with flaps and landing gear retracted. Except as noted in § 25.253(c), V_{FC}/M_{FC} may not be less than a speed midway between V_{MO}/M_{MO} and V_{DF}/M_{DF}, except that, for altitudes where Mach number is the limiting factor, M_{FC} need not exceed the Mach number at which effective speed warning occurs.

(c) *Maximum speed for stability characteristics in icing conditions.* The maximum speed for stability characteristics with the ice accretions defined in appendix C, at which the requirements of §§ 25.143(g), 25.147(e), 25.175(b)(1), 25.177(a) through (c), and 25.181 must be met, is the lower of:

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 9, 2010.

KC Yanamura,

Deputy Director, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–29193 Filed 11–18–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2010–1114; Directorate Identifier 2010–NM–206–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F.28 Mark 0100, 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This proposed AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

Prompted by an accident * * *, the FAA published Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) 88, and the Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA) published Interim Policy INT/POL/25/12. The design review conducted by Fokker on the F28 in response to these regulations revealed that, in case of a lightning strike, an ignition source can develop in the wing tank vapour space during fuel transfer from bag tank CWT [center wing tank], if the electrical power for refuelling is not switched off after refuelling.

Service experience has revealed situations where the power switch of the Fuelling Control Panel (FCP) appeared to be "ON" with the access panel closed. The cam on the access panel that should operate the power switch, if forgotten by flight crew or maintenance staff, can pivot away during closing of the panel, which may result in the switch staying in the "ON" position.

This condition, if not corrected, could result in a wing fuel tank explosion and consequent loss of the aeroplane.

* * * * *

The proposed AD would require actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by January 3, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* (202) 493–2251.
- *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.
- *Hand Delivery:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–40, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact Fokker Services B.V., Technical Services Dept., P.O. Box 231, 2150 AE Nieuw-Vennep, the Netherlands; telephone +31 (0)252–627–350; fax +31 (0)252–627–211; e-mail *technicalservices.fokkerservices@stork.com;* Internet *http://www.myfokkerfleet.com.* You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov;* or in person at the Docket Operations office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone (800) 647–5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Rodriguez, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98057–3356; telephone (425) 227–1137; fax (425) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include "Docket No. FAA–2010–1114; Directorate Identifier 2010–NM–206–AD" at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD based on those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Community, has issued EASA Airworthiness Directive 2010–0139, dated July 1, 2010 (referred to after this as "the MCAI"), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

> Prompted by an accident * * *, the FAA published Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) 88, and the Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA) published Interim Policy INT/POL/25/12. The design review conducted by Fokker on the F28 in response to these regulations revealed that, in case of a lightning strike, an ignition source can develop in the wing tank vapour space during fuel transfer from bag tank CWT [center wing tank], if the electrical power for refuelling is not switched off after refuelling.
>
> Service experience has revealed situations where the power switch of the Fuelling Control Panel (FCP) appeared to be "ON" with the access panel closed. The cam on the access panel that should operate the power switch, if forgotten by flight crew or maintenance staff, can pivot away during closing of the panel, which may result in the switch staying in the "ON" position.
>
> This condition, if not corrected, could result in a wing fuel tank explosion and consequent loss of the aeroplane.
>
> For the reasons described above, this [EASA] AD requires an inspection of the cam and, depending on findings, replacement with an improved part. Subsequently, this AD requires repetitive functional checks of the cam and, depending on findings, the necessary corrective actions.

The corrective action is adjusting the FCP cam until it operates correctly. You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Relevant Service Information

Fokker Services B.V. has issued Fokker Service Bulletins SBF28–28–052, dated April 20, 2010; and SBF100–28–063, dated April 15, 2010. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.