

deformation that would result in a hazardous propeller effect. Environmental degradation may be accounted for by adjustment of the loads during the tests.

(a) The hub, blade retention system, and counterweights must be tested for a period of one hour to a load equivalent to twice the maximum centrifugal load to which the propeller would be subjected during operation at the maximum declared rotational speed.

(b) If appropriate, blade features associated with transitions to the retention system (for example a composite blade bonded to a metallic retention), must be tested either during the test of paragraph (a) of this section or in a separate component test.

(c) Components used with or attached to the propeller (for example spinners, de-icing equipment, and blade shields) must be subjected to a load equivalent to 159 percent of the maximum centrifugal load to which the component would be subjected during operation within the limitations established for the propeller. This must be performed by either:

(1) Testing at the load for a period of 30 minutes, or

(2) Analysis based on test.

#### 3. *Fatigue Limits and Evaluation.*

(a) Fatigue limits.

(1) Fatigue limits must be established by tests, or analysis based on tests, or propeller

(i) Hubs.

(ii) Blades.

(iii) Blade retention components.

(2) The fatigue limits must take into account:

(i) All known and reasonably foreseeable vibration and cyclic load patterns that are expected in service, and

(ii) Expected service deterioration, variations in material properties, manufacturing variations, and environmental effects.

(b) A fatigue evaluation of the propeller must be conducted to show that hazardous propeller effects due to fatigue will be avoided throughout the intended operational life of the propeller on either:

(1) The intended aircraft by complying with §§ 23.907 or 25.907 as applicable, or

(2) A typical aircraft.

#### 4. *Bird Impact Substantiation.*

McCauley must demonstrate, by tests or analysis based on tests or experience on similar designs, that the propeller is capable of withstanding the impact of a four-pound bird at the critical location(s) and critical flight condition(s) of the intended aircraft without causing a major or hazardous propeller effect.

5. *Lightning Strike Substantiation.* McCauley must demonstrate, by test or analysis based on tests or experience on similar designs, that the propeller is capable of withstanding a lightning strike without causing a major or hazardous propeller effect.

Dated: Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on July 24, 2006.

**Francis A. Favara,**

*Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 06-6633 Filed 8-1-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2006-25332; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-40-AD]

**RIN 2120-AA64**

#### **Airworthiness Directives; EADS SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (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) issued by an airworthiness authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The proposed AD would require actions that are intended to address an unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

**DATES:** We must receive comments on this proposed AD by September 1, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Use one of the following addresses to comment on this proposed AD:

- *DOT Docket Web site:* Go to <http://dms.dot.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- *Government-wide rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590.

- *Fax:* (202) 493-2251.

- *Hand delivery:* Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC,

between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in the proposed AD, contact EADS SOCATA, Direction des Services, 65921 Tarbes Cedex 9, France; telephone: 33 (0)5 62.41.73.00; fax: 33 (0)5 62.41.76.54; or SOCATA AIRCRAFT, INC., North Perry Airport, 7501 Airport Road, Pembroke Pines, Florida 33023; telephone: (954) 893-1400; fax: (954) 964-4141.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Gunnar Berg, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4141; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Streamlined Issuance of AD**

The FAA is implementing a new process for streamlining the issuance of ADs related to MCAI. We are prototyping this process and specifically request your comments on its use. You can find more information in FAA draft Order 8040.2, "Airworthiness Directive Process for Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information" which is currently open for comments at [http://www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft\\_docs](http://www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft_docs). This streamlined process will allow us to adopt MCAI safety requirements in a more efficient manner and will reduce safety risks to the public.

This process continues to follow all existing AD issuance processes to meet legal, economic, Administrative Procedure Act, and **Federal Register** requirements. We also continue to follow our technical decision-making processes in all aspects to meet our responsibilities to determine and correct unsafe conditions on U.S.-certificated products.

This proposed AD references the MCAI and related service information that we considered in forming the engineering basis to correct the unsafe condition. The proposed AD contains text copied from the MCAI and for this reason might not follow our plain language principles.

The comment period for this proposed AD is open for 30 days to allow time for comment on both the process and the AD content. In the future, ADs using this process will have a 15-day comment period. The comment period is reduced because the airworthiness authority and manufacturer have already published the documents on which we based our decision, making a longer comment period unnecessary.

## Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written data, views, or arguments regarding this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include the docket number, "FAA-2006-25332; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-40-AD" at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed AD. We are also inviting comments, views, or arguments on the new MCAI process. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend the proposed AD in light of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive concerning this proposed AD.

## Discussion

The Direction Générale de L'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, has issued AD No. F-2005-034, Issue date: February 16, 2005, (referred to after this as "the MCAI"), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states that the aircraft manufacturer has determined that unsatisfactory initial elevator trim actuator greasing may lead to the icing of the elevator trim and generate an untrimmed nose-up attitude after an autopilot disconnection. If not corrected, this condition could result in pitch-up, out-of-trim condition when the autopilot is disconnected. You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the docket.

## Relevant Service Information

EADS SOCATA has issued TBM Aircraft Mandatory Service Bulletin SB70-124, Amendment 1, ATA No. 27, dated January 2005. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

## FAA's Determination and Requirements of the Proposed AD

This product is manufactured outside the United States and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the State of Design's airworthiness authority has notified us of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service

information referenced above. We have examined the airworthiness authority's findings, evaluated all pertinent information, and determined an unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on all products of this type design. We are issuing this proposed AD to correct the unsafe condition.

## Differences Between the Proposed AD and the MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and related service information and, in general, agree with their substance. But we might have found it necessary to use different words from those in the MCAI to ensure the AD is clear for U.S. operators and is enforceable in a U.S. court of law. In making these changes, we do not intend to differ substantively from the information provided in the MCAI and related service information.

We might also have proposed different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow FAA policies. Any such differences are described in a separate paragraph of the proposed AD. These proposed requirements, if ultimately adopted, will take precedence over the actions copied from the MCAI.

## Costs of Compliance

Based on the service information, we estimate that this proposed AD would affect about 256 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 1 work-hour per product to do the action and that the average labor rate is \$80 per work-hour. Required parts would cost about \$8 per product. Where the service information lists required parts costs that are covered under warranty, we have assumed that there will be no charge for these costs. As we do not control warranty coverage for affected parties, some parties may incur costs higher than estimated here. Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators to be \$22,528, or \$88 per product.

## Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies 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 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 have 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 that the proposed regulation:

1. Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866;
2. Is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and
3. 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.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this proposed AD and placed it in the AD docket.

## Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket that contains the proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Office (telephone (800) 647-5227) is located at the street address stated in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

## List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

## The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new AD:

**EADS SOCATA:** FAA–2006–25332;  
Directorate Identifier 2006–CE–40–AD

**Comments Due Date**

(a) We must receive comments on this proposed airworthiness directive (AD) by September 1, 2006.

**Affected ADs**

(b) None.

**Applicability**

(c) This AD applies to the following Model TBM 700 airplanes that are certificated in any U.S. category: serial numbers 1 through 32, 34, 36 through 69, 71 through 76, 79, 81 through 92, 96 through 98, 101, 102, 107 through 109, 112 through 114, 116, 118 through 124, 126 through 130, 132 through 135, 137, 138, 140 through 145, 148 through 155, 157, 158, 161 through 268, and 270 through 304.

**Reason**

(d) The mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) states that the aircraft manufacturer has determined that unsatisfactory initial elevator trim actuator greasing may lead to the icing of the elevator trim and generate an untrimmed nose-up attitude after an autopilot disconnection. If not corrected, this condition could result in pitch-up, out-of-trim condition when the autopilot is disconnected.

**Actions and Compliance**

(e) Unless already done, do the following except as stated in paragraph (f) below.

(1) Within the next 25 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD, lubricate the elevator trim tab actuator rods without removal.

(2) Do the action required in paragraph (e)(1) of the AD following EADS SOCATA TBM Aircraft Mandatory Service Bulletin SB70–124, Amendment 1, ATA No. 27, dated January 2005.

**FAA AD Differences**

(f) None.

**Other FAA AD Provisions**

(g) The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, Standards Staff, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, ATTN: Gunnar Berg, Aerospace Engineer, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4141; facsimile: (816) 329–4090, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(2) *Return to Airworthiness:* When complying with this AD, perform FAA-approved corrective actions before returning the product to an airworthy condition.

(3) *Reporting Requirements:* For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

**Related Information**

(h) This AD is related to MCAI French AD No. F–2005–034, Issue date: February 16, 2005, which references EADS SOCATA TBM Aircraft Mandatory Service Bulletin SB70–124, Amendment 1, ATA No. 27, dated January 2005.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on July 25, 2006.

**James E. Jackson,**

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

[FR Doc. E6–12419 Filed 8–1–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 71**

[Docket No. FAA–2006–25270; Airspace Docket 06–ASO–9]

**Proposed Establishment of Class D Airspace; Eastman, GA**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This notice proposes to change the name of the Eastman-Dodge County Airport to Heart of Georgia Regional Airport and to establish Class D airspace at Eastman, GA. On October 9, 1995, the Eastman-Dodge County Airport Authority adopted a name change for the airport. A non-Federal contract tower with a weather reporting system is being constructed at Heart of Georgia Regional Airport. Therefore, the airport will meet criteria for Class D airspace. Class D surface area airspace is required when the control tower is open to contain Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) and other Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations at the airport. This action would establish Class D airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 2,500 feet MSL within a 4.1-mile radius of the airport.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 1, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments on this proposal to the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You must identify the docket number FAA–2006–25270 Airspace Docket No. 06–ASO–9, at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. You may review the public docket containing the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition in person in the Dockets

Office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket office (telephone 1–800–647–5527) is on the plaza level of the Department of Transportation NASSIF Building at the above address.

An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Division, Federal Aviation Administration, Room 550, 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, Georgia 30337.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mark D. Ward, Manager, System Support, Eastern Service Center, Federal Aviation Administration, P.O. Box 20636, Atlanta, Georgia 30320; telephone (404) 305–5627.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Comments Invited**

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal. Communications should identify both docket numbers and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: “Comments to Docket No. FAA–2006–25270/Airspace Docket No. 06–ASO–9.” The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

**Availability of NPRMs**

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded through the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. Recently published rulemaking documents can also be accessed through the FAA's Web page at <http://www.faa.gov> or the Superintendent of Document's Web page at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara>.