Novel or Unusual Design Features

The BHTI Model 525 helicopter will incorporate the following novel or unusual design features: an advanced CAS system. The novel design includes the integration of audio and visual alerts, tactical sensors, and CAS message consolidation. The new technologies associated with integrated visual, aural, tactile, and alert messaging are more effective in alerting the flightcrew and aiding them in decision-making than the discrete colored lights for warning, caution, and advisory alerts prescribed in §29.1322 alone.

Discussion

The current 14 CFR part 29 standards do not provide adequate standards for the advanced CAS system of the Bell Model 525 helicopter due to the complexity of the aircraft systems and the modes of the fly by wire primary flight controls. The proposed special condition will update definitions, define a prioritization scheme, expand color requirements, and address performance for flightcrew alerting to reflect changes in technology and functionality.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the BHTI Model 525 helicopter. Should BHTI apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would apply to that model as well.

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on one model of helicopter. It is not a rule of general applicability.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 29

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

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

The Proposed Special Conditions

Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes the following special conditions as part of the type certification basis for Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc., Model 525 helicopters.

Flightcrew Alerting

(a) Flightcrew alerts must:

(1) Provide the flightcrew with the information needed to:

(i) Identify non-normal operation or aircraft system conditions, and

(ii) Determine the appropriate actions, if any.

(2) Be readily and easily detectable and intelligible by the flightcrew under all foreseeable operating conditions, including conditions where multiple alerts are provided.

(3) Be removed when the alerting condition no longer exists.

(b) Alerts must conform to the following prioritization hierarchy based on the urgency of flightcrew awareness and response.

(1) Warning: For conditions that require immediate flightcrew awareness and immediate flightcrew response.

(2) Caution: For conditions that require immediate flightcrew awareness and subsequent flightcrew response.

(3) Advisory: For conditions that require flightcrew awareness and may require subsequent flightcrew response.

(c) Warning and caution alerts must:

(1) Be prioritized within each category, when necessary.

(2) Provide timely attention-getting cues through at least two different senses by a combination of aural, visual, or tactile indications.

(3) Permit each occurrence of the attention-getting cues required by paragraph (c)(2) of these special conditions to be acknowledged and suppressed, unless they are required to be continuous.

(d) The alert function must be designed to minimize the effects of false and nuisance alerts. In particular, it must be designed to:

(1) Prevent the presentation of an alert that is inappropriate or unnecessary.

(2) Provide a means to suppress an attention-getting component of an alert caused by a failure of the alerting function that interferes with the flightcrew’s ability to safely operate the helicopter. This means must not be readily available to the flightcrew so that it could be operated inadvertently or by habitual reflexive action. When an alert is suppressed, there must be a clear and unmistakable annunciation to the flightcrew that the alert has been suppressed.

(e) Visual alert indications must:

(1) Conform to the following color convention:

(i) Red for warning alert indications.

(ii) Amber or yellow for caution alert indications.

(iii) Any color except red, amber, yellow, or green for advisory alert indications.

(2) Use visual coding techniques, together with other alerting function elements in the cockpit, to distinguish between warning, caution, and advisory alert indications, if they are presented on monochromatic displays that are not capable of conforming to the color convention in paragraph (e)(1) of these special conditions.

(f) Use of the colors red, amber, and yellow in the cockpit for functions other than flightcrew alerting must be limited and must not adversely affect flightcrew alerting.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on May 24, 2016.

Lance T. Gant
Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–13148 Filed 6–2–16; 8:45 am]
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AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain The Boeing Company Model 787–8 airplanes. This proposed AD was prompted by a report that the grounding jumper between the environmental control system (ECS) bracket and the current return network (CRN) strap near passenger 1 left and 1 right entry doors was not bonded correctly during manufacturing. This proposed AD would require changing the configuration of the grounding jumpers connecting the ECS brackets and CRN straps; measuring the bond resistance; and related investigative and corrective actions if necessary. We are proposing this AD to prevent an incorrectly bonded jumper between the ECS bracket and the CRN strap, which does not provide proper grounding to the door frames at door 1 left and 1 right. If a fault occurs, an electrical shock hazard can exist to passengers and flight crew and could result in personal or fatal injury.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by July 18, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:
We have received no definitive data that would enable us to provide cost estimates for the on-condition actions specified in this proposed AD. According to the manufacturer, some of the costs of this proposed AD may be covered under warranty, thereby reducing the cost impact on affected individuals. We do not control warranty coverage for affected individuals. As a result, we have included all costs in our cost estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Labor cost</th>
<th>Parts cost</th>
<th>Cost per product</th>
<th>Cost on U.S. operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>6 work-hours × $85 per hour = $510</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$3,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authority for This Rulemaking**

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA’s authority to issue rules on aviation safety. 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.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: "General requirements." Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD 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.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify this proposed regulation:

(1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866.

(2) Is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979).

(3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(4) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA proposes to amend 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

§ 39.13 [Amended]

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

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

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):


(a) Comments Due Date

We must receive comments by July 18, 2016.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to The Boeing Company Model 787–8 airplanes, certified in any category, as identified in Boeing Service Bulletin B787–81205–SB30025–00, Issue 001, dated July 17, 2014.

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 53; Fuselage.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by a report that the grounding jumper between the environmental control system (ECS) bracket and the current return network (CRN) strap near passenger 1 left and 1 right entry doors was not bonded correctly during manufacturing. We are issuing this AD to prevent an incorrectly bonded jumper between the ECS bracket and the CRN strap, which does not provide proper grounding to the door frames at door 1 left and 1 right. If a fault occurs, an electrical shock hazard can exist to passengers and flight crew and could result in personal or fatal injury.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Grounding Jumper Revision

Within 12 months after the effective date of this AD: Change the configuration of the grounding jumpers connecting the ECS brackets and CRN straps, including measuring the bond resistance and doing all applicable related investigative and corrective actions, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing Service Bulletin B787–81205–SB530025–00, Issue 001, dated July 17, 2014. Do all applicable related investigative and corrective actions before further flight.

(h) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(1) The Manager, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector, or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the ACO, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (i)(1) of this AD. Information may be emailed to: 9-ANM-Seattle-ACO-AMOC-Requests@faa.gov.

(2) Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/ certificate holding district office.

(3) An AMOC that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used for any repair, modification, or alteration required by this AD if it is approved by the Boeing Commercial Airlines Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) that has been authorized by the Manager, Seattle ACO, to make those findings. To be approved, the repair method, modification deviation, or alteration deviation must meet the certification basis of the airplane, and the approval must specifically refer to this AD.

(i) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Brendan Shanley, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA 98057–3356; phone: 425–917–6492; fax: 425–917–6590; email: brendan.shanley@faa.gov.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airlines, Attention: Data & Services Management, P.O. Box 3707, MC 2H–65, Seattle, WA 98124–2207; telephone 206–544–5000, extension 1; fax 206–766–5680; Internet https://www.myboeingfleet.com. You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 20, 2016.

Victor Wicklund,
Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–12849 Filed 6–2–16; 8:45 am]
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AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Ameri-King Corporation emergency locator transmitters (ELTs) as installed on various aircraft. This proposed AD was prompted by multiple reports of ELT failure. This proposed AD was also prompted by a report of noncompliance to quality standards and manufacturer processes related to Ameri-King Corporation ELTs. Failure to adhere to these standards and processes could result in ELTs that do not function. This proposed AD would require repetitive