

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-CE-09-AD; Amendment 39-9872; AD 97-01-01]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. PA24, PA28R, PA30, PA32R, PA34, and PA39 Series Airplanes; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document makes a correction to Airworthiness Directive (AD) 97-01-01, which was published in the **Federal Register** on January 2, 1997 (62 FR 10), and concerns The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. (Piper) PA24, PA28R, PA30, PA32R, PA34, and PA39 series airplanes. The amendment number in this AD is incorrectly referenced as Amendment 39-9782 instead of 39-9872 in two places. All other reference is correct. The AD currently requires repetitively inspecting the main gear sidebrace studs for cracks, and replacing any main gear sidebrace stud found cracked. This action corrects the AD to reflect the right amendment number throughout the entire document.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina Marsh, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, suite 2-160, College Park, Georgia 30337-2748; telephone (404) 305-7362; facsimile (404) 305-7348.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

On December 23, 1996, the FAA issued AD 97-01-01, Amendment 39-9872 (62 FR 10, January 2, 1997), which applies to Piper PA24, PA28R, PA30, PA32R, PA34, and PA39 series airplanes. This AD requires repetitively inspecting the main gear sidebrace studs for cracks, and replacing any main gear sidebrace stud found cracked.

Need for the Correction

The amendment number in this AD is incorrectly referenced as 39-9782, instead of 39-9872, in two different places. All other reference is correct. As written, operators of Piper PA24, PA28R, PA30, PA32R, PA34, and PA39 series airplanes may log compliance with the right AD number, but the wrong amendment number, therefore

causing the potential for confusion as to whether they are in compliance with the AD.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication of January 2, 1997 (62 FR 10), of Amendment 39-9872; AD 97-01-01, which was the subject of FR Doc. 96-33231, is corrected as follows:

§ 39.13 [Corrected]

On page 11, in the third column, section 39.13, the 12th line from the top of the column, correct "Amendment 39-9782" to "Amendment 39-9872".

On page 14, in the second column, section 39.13, in paragraph (h) of the AD, the 24th line from the bottom of the column, correct "(39-9782)" to "(39-9872)".

Action is taken herein to correct this reference in AD 97-01-01 and to add this AD correction to section 39.13 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 39.13).

The effective date remains February 7, 1997.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on March 26, 1997.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97-8250 Filed 3-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 93-CE-45-AD; Amendment 39-9984; AD 97-07-10]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland DHC-6 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to de Havilland DHC-6 series airplanes that do not have a certain wing strut modification (Modification 6/1581) incorporated. This action requires inspecting the wing struts for cracks or damage (chafing, etc.), replacing wing struts that are found damaged beyond certain limits or are found cracked, and incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 to prevent future chafing damage. This AD results from several reports of wing strut damage caused by the upper fairing rubbing against the wing strut. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of the wing struts, which could result in loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: Effective May 23, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of May 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from de Havilland, Inc., 123 Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario, Canada, M3K 1Y5. This information may also be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket 93-CE-45-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: Jon Hjelm, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581; telephone (516) 256-7523; facsimile (516) 568-2716.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to de Havilland DHC-6 series airplanes that do not have a certain wing strut modification (Modification 6/1581) incorporated was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on October 3, 1996 (61 FR 51619). The NPRM proposed to require inspecting the wing struts for cracks or damage (chafing, etc.), replacing wing struts that are found damaged beyond certain limits or are found cracked, and incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 to prevent future chafing damage. Modification No. 6/1581 consists of installing a preformed nylon shield around the area of each wing strut of the upper end closest to the wing. Accomplishment of the proposed inspection and modification as specified in the NPRM would be required in accordance with de Havilland Service Bulletin No. 6/342, dated February 23, 1976.

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.

The 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 AD 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.

FAA's Aging Commuter Aircraft Policy

This AD is consistent with the FAA's aging commuter airplane policy. This policy simply states that reliance on repetitive inspections of critical areas on airplanes utilized in commuter service carries an unnecessary safety risk when a design change exists that could eliminate or, in certain instances, reduce the number of those critical inspections. The alternative to incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 on de Havilland DHC-6 series airplanes would be relying on repetitive inspections to detect damaged wing struts.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 169 airplanes in the U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 8 workhours per airplane to accomplish the required action, and that the average labor rate is approximately \$60 an hour. Parts cost approximately \$150 per airplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$106,470. This figure is based upon the presumption that no affected airplane owner/operator has incorporated Modification No. 6/1581.

De Havilland has informed the FAA that enough parts have been distributed to equip approximately 11 of the affected airplanes. Presuming that each set of parts is incorporated on an affected airplane, the cost impact upon U.S. operators/owners would be reduced by \$6,930 from \$106,470 to \$99,540.

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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

97-07-10 Dehavilland: Amendment 39-9984; Docket No. 93-CE-45-AD.

Applicability: Models DHC-6-1, DHC-6-100, DHC-6-200, and DHC-6-300 airplanes (all serial numbers), certificated in any category, that do not have Modification No. 6/1581 incorporated.

Note 1: Modification No. 6/1581 consists of installing a preformed nylon shield around the area of each wing strut at the upper end closest to the wing.

Note 2: 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 already accomplished.

To prevent failure of the wing struts, which could result in loss of control of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Within the next 100 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, inspect the wing struts, part number (P/

N) C6W1005 (or FAA-approved equivalent), for cracks or damage (chafing, etc.) in accordance with the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of de Havilland Service Bulletin (SB) No. 6/342, dated February 23, 1976.

(1) If damage is found on a wing strut that exceeds 0.025-inch in depth, exceeds a total length of 5 inches, or where any two places of damage are separated by less than 10 inches of undamaged surface over the length of the strut, prior to further flight, replace the wing strut with an airworthy FAA-approved part in accordance with the applicable maintenance manual.

(2) If any crack is found, prior to further flight, replace the wing strut with an airworthy FAA-approved part in accordance with the applicable maintenance manual.

(3) If damage is found on a wing strut that exceeds 0.010-inch in depth, provided the damage does not exceed 0.025-inch in depth, the damage does not exceed a total length of 5 inches, and where any two places of damage are separated by a minimum of 10 inches undamaged surface over the length of the strut, within 500 hours TIS after the inspection specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, replace the wing strut with an airworthy FAA-approved part in accordance with the applicable maintenance manual.

(b) Within the next 600 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, incorporate Modification No. 6/1581 in accordance with the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of de Havilland SB No. 6/342, dated February 23, 1976.

(1) Incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 eliminates the repetitive inspection requirement of this AD.

(2) Incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 may be accomplished at any time prior to 600 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, at which time it must be incorporated.

(c) 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.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance times that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York ACO.

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

(e) The inspections and modification required by this AD shall be done in accordance de Havilland Service Bulletin No. 6/342, dated February 23, 1976. 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 de Havilland, Inc., 123 Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario M3K 1Y5 Canada. Copies 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.

(f) This amendment (39-9984) becomes effective on May 23, 1997.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 26, 1997.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97-8249 Filed 3-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-CE-10-AD; Amendment 39-9985; AD 97-07-11]

Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Aircraft Limited HP137 Mk1, Jetstream Series 200, and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes Airworthiness Directive (AD) 81-20-01, which currently requires repetitively inspecting the nose landing gear (NLG) actuator support structure and the front pressure bulkhead for cracks on Jetstream Aircraft Limited (JAL) HP137 Mk1 and Jetstream series 200 airplanes, and replacing any cracked part. This AD retains the repetitive inspections required by AD 81-20-01; requires repetitively inspecting the NLG retraction jack upper mounting fitting and attachment hardware for security bolt failure and for bolts with improper torque levels on the HP137 Mk1, Jetstream series 200, and Jetstream Model 3101 airplanes, and requires replacing any failed security bolts and adjusting any bolt with an improper torque level; and requires modifying the NLG retraction jack on all affected airplanes, as terminating action for the repetitive inspections. This AD results from reports of NLG jack mounting fitting failures on several of the affected airplanes, and the Federal Aviation Administration's policy on aging commuter-class aircraft. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of the NLG caused by a cracked NLG actuator support structure or cracked front pressure bulkhead, which, if not detected and corrected, could lead to nose gear collapse and damage to the airplane.

DATES: Effective May 23, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director

of the Federal Register as of May 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from Jetstream Aircraft Limited, Prestwick International Airport, Ayrshire, KA9 2RW, Scotland, telephone (44-292) 79888; facsimile (44-292) 79703; or Jetstream Aircraft Inc., Librarian, P.O. Box 16029, Dulles International Airport, Washington, D.C. 20041-6029; telephone (703) 406-1161; facsimile (703) 406-1469. This information may also be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-CE-10-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. Tom Rodriguez, Program Manager, Brussels Aircraft Certification Division, FAA, Europe, Africa, and Middle East Office, c/o American Embassy, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium; telephone (32 2) 508.2715; facsimile (32 2) 230.6899; or Mr. S.M. Nagarajan, Project Officer, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, FAA, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone (816) 426-6932; facsimile (816) 426-2169.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Events Leading to the Issuance of This AD

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to certain JAL HP137 Mk1, Jetstream series 200, and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 airplanes that do not have an improved design attachment bracket (Modification JM 5285) installed for the nose landing gear (NLG) retraction jack was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on September 19, 1995 (60 FR 48429). The NPRM proposed to supersede AD 81-20-01 with a new AD that would:

—Retain the requirement contained in AD 81-20-01 of repetitively inspecting (using dye penetrant methods) the NLG actuator support structure and the front pressure bulkhead for cracks on JAL HP137 Mk1 and Jetstream series 200 airplanes that do not have the front pressure bulkhead strengthened in the area of the NLG jack attachment fitting (Modification No. 5127), and replacing or repairing any cracked NLG actuator support structure or cracked front pressure bulkhead.

Accomplishment of the proposed inspections as specified in the NPRM would be in accordance with Jetstream Service Bulletin (SB) No. 6/5, dated September 4, 1978.

—Require repetitively inspecting the NLG retraction jack upper mounting fitting and attachment hardware for security bolt failure and bolts with improper torque levels on the HP137 Mk1, Jetstream series 200, and Jetstream Model 3101 airplanes, and replacing any failed security bolts and adjusting any bolt with an improper torque level. Accomplishment of the proposed inspections as specified in the NPRM would be in accordance with Jetstream SB 53-A-JA870510, which consists of the following pages and revision levels:

Pages	Revision level	Date
3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10.	Original Issue.	May 26, 1987.
1, 2, 4 and 7 ..	Revision 1	Nov. 10, 1987.

—Require modifying the NLG retraction jack on the HP137 Mk1, Jetstream series 200, and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 airplanes, as terminating action for all the repetitive inspections, including the inspections referenced in the Model 3201 maintenance manual.

Accomplishment of the proposed modification as specified in the NPRM would be in accordance with Jetstream SB 53-JM 5285, which consists of the following pages and revision levels:

Pages	Revision level	Date
1 and 4 2, 3, and 5 through 26.	Revision 2 Revision 1	Nov. 12, 1992. May 18, 1992.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. One comment was received regarding the NPRM. An analysis of the comment follows:

The commenter provides information on the company's fleet size and the estimated projection on when the proposed replacement would be mandatory on the affected airplanes in the company's fleet, as well as the number of repetitive inspections that would be required during that time. The commenter states that it is more economical for the company to incorporate the modification on its entire fleet immediately rather than continuing to repetitively inspect. The commenter also mentions that parts to