

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

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

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

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

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

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

96-22-11 Boeing: Amendment 39-9799.
Docket 96-NM-36-AD.

Applicability: Model 737-100 and -200 series airplanes, as identified in Boeing Service Letter 737-SL-29-21, dated December 16, 1982; and Model 747-100, -200, -300, and -SP series airplanes, as identified in Boeing Service Letter 747-SL-32-19, dated January 16, 1980; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the hydraulic fuse, which could result in the failure of one or more hydraulic systems and resultant reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) For Model 737-100 and -200 series airplanes: Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, replace Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies, having Waterman part number (P/N) G838-8-40, G838-8-60, or G838-8-160, with modified assemblies

having P/N G8381-8-40, G8381-8-60, or G8381-8-160, respectively; or with a PneuDrualics fuse specified in Boeing Service Letter 737-SL-29-21, dated December 16, 1982, including Attachments 1, 2, and 3, dated April 15, 1982. Accomplish the replacement in accordance with the service letter.

Note 2: The Boeing service letter references Imperial Clevite, Inc., Service Bulletins G838-80-4, G838-80-5, and G838-80-6, all dated April 15, 1982, as additional sources of service information for accomplishment of the replacement.

(b) For Model 747-100, -200, -300, and -SP series airplanes: Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, replace Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies, having Waterman P/N G905-120, with PneuDrualics assemblies having PneuDrualics P/N 6105, in accordance with Boeing Service Letter 747-SL-32-19, dated January 16, 1980.

(c) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install on any airplane Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies having Waterman P/N G838-8-40, G838-8-60, G838-8-160, or G905-120.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Seattle ACO.

(e) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(f) The replacement shall be done in accordance with the following Boeing service letters, as applicable, which include the specified list of effective pages:

Service letter referenced and date	Page No.	Revision level shown on page	Date shown on page
737-SL-29-21, December 16, 1982	1, 2 Attachment 1, Page 1, 2; Attachment 2, Page 1, 2; Attachment 3, Page 1, 2.	December 16, 1982. April 15, 1982.
747-SL-32-19, January 16, 1980	1, 2	January 16, 1980.

This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124-2207. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on December 11, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 22, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-27645 Filed 11-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-CE-85-AD; Amendment 39-9801; AD 96-22-13]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives: Pilatus Aircraft Ltd., Model PC-6 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. (Pilatus), Model PC-6 airplanes. This action requires inspecting for loose or sheared rivets in the hinge brackets on the horizontal stabilizer and inspecting for incorrect spacing tolerance of the hinge brackets. If the rivets are found loose or sheared, the AD requires replacing the rivets and also re-positioning the hinge brackets, if found incorrectly spaced. Several reports of rivets shearing on the hinge brackets prompted this action. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent structural failure of the hinge bracket on the horizontal stabilizer, which could result in partial or complete loss of control of the horizontal stabilizer and loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: Effective December 27, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 27, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from Pilatus Aircraft Ltd., CH-6370 Stans, Switzerland. This information may also be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket 95-CE-85-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Roman T. Gabrys, Project Officer, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, FAA, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone (816) 426-6934; facsimile (816) 426-2169.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Events Leading to This Action

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to Pilatus Model PC-6 airplanes was published in the Federal Register on June 11, 1996 (61 FR 29501). The action proposed to require the following:

- Inspecting the hinge brackets attached to the fuselage for loose or sheared rivets,
- Inspecting the hinge brackets for correct spacing tolerance and positioning,
- Removing the brackets and adjusting any incorrect spacing or positioning, and
- Replacing any loose or sheared rivets with new rivets.

Related Service Information

Accomplishment of this action would be in accordance with Pilatus Service Bulletin (SB) PC-6 165, dated February 7, 1994.

Comments

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were received on the proposed rule or the FAA's determination of the cost to the public.

FAA's Determination

After careful review of all available information related to the subject presented above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed except for minor editorial corrections. The FAA has determined that these minor corrections will not change the meaning of the AD and will not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that one airplane in the U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take less than 1 workhour per airplane to accomplish these actions, and that the average labor rate is approximately \$60 an hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of this AD for the only U.S. operator is estimated to be \$60. This is the cost of the inspection only and does not include the cost for replacing any loose rivets, if found. This figure is based on the assumption that the affected owner/operator of the affected airplane has not performed the inspection or modification.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities

under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the final evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

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

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

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

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

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

96-22-13 Pilatus Aircraft Ltd.: Amendment 39-9801; Docket No. 95-CE-85-AD.

Applicability: Model PC-6 airplanes (all serial numbers), certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (e) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required within the next 75 hours time-in-service (TIS), after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

Note 2: The compliance time required in this AD takes precedence over the compliance time in Pilatus Service Bulletin PC-6 165, dated February 7, 1994.

To prevent structural failure of the hinge bracket on the horizontal stabilizer, which could result in partial or complete loss of control of the horizontal stabilizer and loss of control of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Inspect the hinge brackets on the horizontal stabilizer for sheared or loose rivets in accordance with paragraph 2.A. in the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of Pilatus Service Bulletin (SB) PC-6 165, dated February 7, 1994.

(b) Inspect the spacing tolerance of the hinge bracket in accordance with paragraph 2.C. in the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of Pilatus SB PC-6 165, dated February 7, 1994.

(c) If there are loose or sheared rivets or if the bracket spacing is out of the spacing tolerance, prior to further flight, modify the position and space tolerance of the hinge brackets, and replace any loose or sheared rivets in accordance with paragraph 2.D. in the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of Pilatus SB PC-6 165, dated February 7, 1994.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance times that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, FAA, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Small Airplane Directorate.

(f) The inspection, modification, and replacement required by this AD shall be done in accordance of Pilatus Service Bulletin PC-6 165, dated February 7, 1994. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies of this document may be obtained from Pilatus Aircraft Ltd., CH-6370 Stans, Switzerland. Copies also may be inspected at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri, or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(g) This amendment (39-9801) becomes effective on December 27, 1996.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on October 22, 1996.

Michael Gallagher,
Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-27676 Filed 11-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-9804; AD 96-22-15]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 series airplanes, that requires repetitive Tap Test inspections to detect debonding of the elevator skins, and corrective actions, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by a report of a debonded area of the upper skin of an elevator that was discovered during a visual inspection. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent the presence of water in the elevator, which could cause debonding of the elevator skins and, consequently, adversely affect the structural integrity of the elevator.

DATES: Effective December 11, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 11, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Huber, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-2589; fax (206) 227-1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 series airplanes was published in the Federal Register as a supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on July 12, 1996 (61 FR 36664). That action proposed to require repetitive Tap Test inspections to detect debonding of the elevator skins, and corrective actions, if necessary.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Request to Withdraw the Proposal

The Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, on behalf of two of its member operators, and the

manufacturer have no technical objection to the proposal, but request that the FAA withdraw the proposal. These commenters state that the entire affected U.S. fleet has been modified already, so there is no need for an AD.

The FAA does not concur with the commenters' request to withdraw the proposal. Even if the current U.S.-registered fleet is in compliance with the requirements of the AD, the issuance of the rule is still necessary to ensure that any affected airplane that is imported and placed on the U.S. register in the future will be required to be in compliance as well. The manufacturer has provided no supporting data to the FAA demonstrating that all of the affected airplanes, worldwide, have been modified; therefore, the possibility exists that an unmodified airplane could be imported to the U.S. at some future time. Issuance of this AD will ensure that any such airplane is modified prior to the time it is permitted to operate in the U.S.

Request to Include Equipment Costs in the Economic Analysis

Two commenters state that their fleet of airplanes have already accomplished the actions of the proposed rule; however, one of the commenters advises that the cost of the thermographic inspections required by the proposed rule involves the use of equipment that costs approximately \$30,000. The commenter notes that the cost impact information presented in the preamble to the notice does not take this factor into consideration, but it should have.

The FAA does not concur that a change to the information is necessary. The thermographic inspections that the commenter refers to are inspections that must be accomplished in the event that debonding is detected and the amount of it is outside the limits specified in the service bulletin. The economic analysis of the AD is limited only to the cost of actions actually required by the rule. It does not consider the costs of "on condition" actions (that is, actions taken to correct an unsafe condition if found), since those actions would be required to be accomplished, regardless of AD direction, in order to correct an unsafe condition identified in an airplane and to ensure operation of that airplane in an airworthy condition, as required by the Federal Aviation Regulations. In addition, the FAA has taken into consideration that some operators already may have the equipment at their main base, or that such equipment can be rented, borrowed, etc. The FAA also is aware that some manufacturers provide certain equipment on temporary loan to operators. Moreover, based on