prevent the interstate spread of brucellosis.

Because prior notice and other public procedures with respect to this action are impracticable and contrary to the public interest under these conditions, we find good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553 to make this action effective upon signature. We will consider comments that are received within 60 days of publication of this rule in the **Federal Register**. After the comment period closes, we will publish another document in the **Federal Register**. The document will include a discussion of any comments we receive and any amendments we are making to the rule as a result of the comments.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review process required by Executive Order 12866.

Cattle moved interstate are moved for slaughter, for use as breeding stock, or for feeding. Changing the brucellosis status of Florida from Class Free to Class A increases testing requirements governing the interstate movement of cattle. However, testing requirements for cattle moved interstate for immediate slaughter or to quarantined feedlots are not affected by this change. Cattle from certified brucellosis-free herds moving interstate are not affected by this change.

The groups affected by this action will be herd owners in Florida, as well as buyers and importers of cattle from this State.

There are an estimated 20,000 cattle herds in Florida that will be affected by this rule. All of these are owned by small entities. Test-eligible cattle offered for sale interstate from other than certified brucellosis-free herds must be tested for brucellosis under Class A status regulations, but not under regulations concerning Class Free status. If such testing were distributed equally among all animals affected by this rule, the change to Class A status would cost approximately $4 per head.

Therefore, we believe that changing the brucellosis status of Florida will not have a significant economic impact on the small entities affected by this interim rule.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12372

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

Executive Order 12988

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are in conflict with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 78

Animal diseases, Bison, Cattle, Hogs, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR part 78 as follows:

PART 78—BRUCELLOSIS

1. The authority citation for part 78 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 111–114a–1, 114g, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123–126, 134b, and 134f; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

§ 78.41 [Amended]

2. In § 78.41, paragraph (a) is amended by removing ''Florida,''.

3. In § 78.41, paragraph (b) is amended by adding ''Florida,'' immediately before ''Kansas,''.

Done in Washington, DC, this 13th day of August, 1998.

Joan M. Arnoldi,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 98–22462 Filed 8–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–ANE–27–AD; Amendment 39–10713; AD 98–17–11]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Textron Lycoming and Teledyne Continental Motors Reciprocating Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Textron Lycoming and Teledyne Continental Motors reciprocating engines that had crankshafts repaired by Nelson Balancing Service, Repair Station Certificate No. NB7R820J, Bedford, Massachusetts, that requires removal from service of affected crankshafts, or a visual inspection, magnetic particle inspection, and dimensional check of the crankshaft journals, and, if necessary, rework or removal from service of affected crankshafts and replacement with serviceable parts. This amendment is prompted by reports of crankshafts exhibiting heat check cracking of the nitrided bearing surfaces which led to crankshaft cracking and subsequent failure. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent crankshaft failure due to cracking, which could result in an inflight engine failure and possible forced landing.

DATES: Effective October 19, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rocco Viselli, Aerospace Engineer (assigned to Textron Lycoming), New York Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 10 Fifth St., 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, NY 11581–1200; telephone (516) 256–7531, fax (516) 568–2716; or Jerry Robinette, Aerospace Engineer (assigned to Teledyne Continental Motors), Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 1895 Phoenix Boulevard, One Crown Center, Suite 450, Atlanta, GA 30349; telephone (770) 703–6096, fax (770) 703–6097.

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 Textron Lycoming and Teledyne Continental Motors (TCM) reciprocating engines that had crankshafts repaired by Nelson Balancing Service, Repair Station

Certificate No. NB7R820J, Bedford, Massachusetts, was published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1998 (63 FR 25781). That action proposed to require removal from service of affected crankshafts, or a visual inspection, magnetic particle inspection, and dimensional check of the crankshaft journals, and, if necessary, rework or removal from service of affected crankshafts and replacement with serviceable parts.

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

One commenter states that the proposed AD is insufficiently researched; specific dates and serial numbers are needed for affected crankshafts. The commenter suggests that there were periods during the time frame of interest when the grinding was acceptable. The FAA does not concur. The FAA believes that this AD has been thoroughly researched. The failures/known cases of crankshaft nitride cracking occur throughout the time period. There is no way to isolate one specific time and determine that crankshafts during that time were satisfactorily repaired. Those crankshafts that are identified in the company's records are presented in the AD, but the FAA has determined that these records are incomplete. Therefore, the applicability of the AD must include all crankshafts identified in aircraft owners' and other repair station records as being repaired at Nelson during the suspect time period.

The same commenter questions how many TCM O–470 crankshafts have been determined to be bad and if there is a sufficient percentage to warrant tearing down all O–470 engines that Nelson repaired during this time period. The FAA does not concur. The available data indicates that crankshafts from O–470 engines were subject to the same improper repair procedures as crankshafts from other engines. Of the three related failure events, one occurred on an O–470–R engine. Therefore, the FAA has determined that all crankshafts repaired by Nelson Air Services during the suspect time period have the potential of causing an unsafe condition.

The same commenter believes that the proposed AD is based on failures of aerobatic engines. The commenter suggests that the AD is an overly reactive extrapolation from highly stressed aerobatic crankshafts to comparatively mildly stressed non-aerobatic engines. The FAA does not concur. The FAA is unaware of any information that indicates that the safety analysis presented in the NPRM is biased by aerobatic engine data. There is only one aerobatic engine listed. The other engines are used in normal or utility category applications. The data indicates that nitride cracking of the crankshafts is not limited to specific flight operations but rather a matter of an improper grinding procedure that can result in heat check cracking of the nitride surface.

The same commenter states that the AD should not be issued as written, but only imposed on those who have a reasonable likelihood of having a bad crankshaft, due to expense required to tear down an engine. The FAA does not concur. The expense of the AD was certainly considered as evidenced by the NPRM economic impact statement. However, it must be emphasized that the FAA has made a determination that an unsafe condition is likely to exist on crankshafts repaired by Nelson during the suspect time period. The FAA determined that an AD was necessary after consideration of both the severity of the potential unsafe condition and the economic impact of the action.

One commenter states that the AD should not apply to crankshafts which were in the Nelson shop for balancing, it should only apply to those which had the journals ground. The FAA does not concur. The data indicates that deficient process controls existed at Nelson Balancing Service during the suspect time period and therefore all crankshafts which were repaired in the Nelson shop during that time are suspect. However, if an individual can substantiate that any given crankshaft should be exempt from the requirements of the AD based on the extent of repairs performed by Nelson, then this data can be presented through an FAA Airworthiness Inspector as an Alternative Method of Compliance with the AD.

This commenter further states that the AD should reaffirm that only those work order numbers noted in the AD are affected. The FAA does not agree. The work orders listed in the AD are intended as guidance only as the FAA can not be absolutely sure that all crankshafts are accounted for in the listing.

One commenter states that the AD should apply only to those crankshafts repaired after September 1995, arguing that date represented the earliest repair date for the crankshaft that demonstrated a problem in service after being serviced by Nelson. The FAA does not concur. The crankshaft with the earliest repair date to have exhibited a problem in service was repaired in February 1995 and failed after only 30 hours in service. The repair station was certificated in September 1994. Thus, the FAA has limited this AD to only those engines with crankshafts on which this unsafe condition either exists or is likely to develop.

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

There are approximately 250,000 engines of the designs listed in the applicability section of this AD in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 200,000 of those engines are installed on aircraft of U.S. registry. Of these it is estimated that 30% or 60,000 engines will have had an overhaul in the time frame of interest; however, only 291 would be required to take compliance action. Of this 60,000 it is estimated that 10,000 will require removal of the propeller spinner to determine applicability of the AD. The cost associated with the spinner removal/replacement is estimated to be $60 per work hour average labor rate times one hour. It will take approximately 90 work hours per engine to accomplish the proposed action and the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost $115 per engine for gaskets, seals, etc. In addition, it is estimated that half of the 291 affected engines can be reworked at a cost of $1,800 per engine and that the other half of the 291 affected engines will be rejected, plus purchasing another crankshaft which will cost $4,000 per engine. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $3,048,765.

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, 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:

98–17–11 Textron Lycoming and Teledyne Continental Motors: Amendment 39–10713. Docket 98–ANE–27–AD.

Textron Lycoming (LYC) O–235, O–235–C1, O–235–C2C, O–235–L2C, O–235–N2C, O–290, O–290–D2, O–320, O–320–A, O–320–A1A, O–320–A2B, O–320–B2B, O–320–B2C, O–320–D2J, O–320–D3G, O–320–E2A, O–320–E2D, O–320–E2G, O–320–E3D, O–320–H2AD, O–360, O–360A1A, O–360–A1D, O–360–A3A, O–360–A4A, O–360–A4K, O–360–B1B, IO–360–F1A6, AEIO–320–E1B, HIO–360–C1A, IO–320, IO–320–B1A, IO–360, IO–360–A1A, IO–360–A1B6, IO–360–B1E, IO–360–C, IO–360–C1C, IO–360–C1C6, IO–360–C1D6, IO–360–D, O–540–A1B5, O–540–A1D5, O–540–R2AD, IO–540, IO–540–C4B5, IO–540–S1A5, TIO–540–A2, LIO–320–C1A, LIO–360–C1E6, and IO–720 reciprocating engines; and Teledyne Continental Motors (TCM) A–65, A65–3, A65–8, A75, A75–8, C75–12, C85, C85–8, C85–12, C90–8FJ, C90–12, O–200, O–200–A, O–300, O–300–D, IO–360–C, E–185–4, E–225–8, O–470, O–470–K, O–470–L, O–470–R, O–470–11, IO–470, IO–470–N, IO–470–S, IO–520, IO–520–D, GTSIO–520, and TSIO–520–VB reciprocating engines, with installed crankshafts repaired by Nelson Balancing Service, Bedford, Massachusetts, Repair Station Certificate No. NB7R820J, between February 1, 1995, and December 31, 1997, inclusive, as listed (by work order (W/O)) in Table 1 of this AD.

TABLE 1

Engine and model	W/O	Date	Engine Ser. No.
LYC:			
AEIO–320–E1B	1134	2/17/96	L–5653–55A
HIO–360–C1A	1155	2/7/96	L–12126–51A
IO–320	1141	1/17/96	
IO–320–B1A	1525	11/14/97	
IO–360	1314	12/17/96	
IO–360	IN6137	8/7/97	
IO–360–A1A	1230	6/10/96	L–474–51
IO–360–A1A	1289	10/23/96	L–4085–5174
IO–360–A1A	1415b	5/23/97	RL–3920–51A
IO–360–A1B6	1463	7/31/97	
IO–360–B1E	1312	12/12/96	L–4453–51A
IO–360–C	1146	1/23/96	R–51448–9–C
IO–360–C1C	1336	2/10/97	
IO–360–C1C	1518	12/9/97	
IO–360–C1C6	1530	11/25/97	
IO–360–C1C6	1537	12/9/97	L–19294–51A
IO–360–C1D6	1286	4/28/97	
IO–360–D	1540	12/2/97	
IO–360–F1A6	1176	3/7/96	L–27423–36A
IO–540	1014	2/8/95	
IO–540	1056	6/13/95	
IO–540	1302	12/5/96	
IO–540–C4B5	1313	12/17/96	L–19547–48
IO–540–S1A5	1513	10/27/97	L–19597–48A
IVO–435–G1A	1271	10/1/96	
LIO–320–C1A	1158	2/8/96	
LIO–360–C1E6	1280	10/7/96	
LIO–360–C1E6	1281	10/9/96	
O–235	1013	2/21/95	
O–235	1051	6/2/95	
O–235	1054	6/9/95	
O–235	1057	6/14/95	L–9041–15
O–235	1058	6/29/95	
O–235	1060	6/30/95	
O–235	1069	8/10/95	
O–235	1110	2/20/96	
O–235	1145	1/23/96	
O–235	1151	1/25/96	
O–235	1160	2/9/96	RL–24636–15
O–235	1305	12/5/96	L–22542–15
O–235	1329	2/11/97	
O–235	1332	2/11/97	
O–235	1481	9/2/97	
O–235–C1	1089	10/8/95	L–6475–15
O–235–C1	1188	4/2/96	L–7143–15
O–235–C1	1335	3/12/97	L–5569–15
O–235–C1	1367	3/24/97	
O–235–C2C	1019	2/24/95	L–12284–15

TABLE 1—Continued

Engine and model	W/O	Date	Engine Ser. No.
O–235–C2C	1040	5/8/95	
O–235–C2C	1105	12/1/95	L–12273–15
O–235–L2C	1030	4/6/95	L–14545–15
O–235–L2C	1036	4/24/95	
O–235–L2C	1037	4/24/95	L–23012–15
O–235–L2C	1050	6/2/95	L–15542–15
O–235–L2C	1062	7/5/95	L–18306–15
O–235–L2C	1067	8/8/95	
O–235–L2C	1070	8/10/95	L–160015–15
O–235–L2C	1095	11/14/95	RL–023227–15
O–235–L2C	1101	11/4/95	L–15300–15
O–235–L2C	1102	11/15/95	L–20183–15
O–235–L2C	1162	2/14/96	L–16114–15
O–235–L2C	1179	3/11/96	L–21215–15
O–235–L2C	1219	5/16/96	L–21215–15
O–235–L2C	1251	8/22/96	
O–235–L2C	1285	10/19/96	
O–235–L2C	1365	3/24/97	
O–235–L2C	1400	4/28/97	
O–235–L2C	1414	8/5/97	
O–235–L2C	1417	12/5/97	
O–235–L2C	1433	6/26/97	L–17074–15
O–235–L2C	1435	6/9/97	
O–235–L2C	1504	10/31/97	
O–235–L2C	1508	11/18/97	
O–235–L2C	1524	11/12/97	
O–235–L2C	1536	11/24/97	
O–235–L2C	2010	11/19/97	
O–235–N2C	1511	10/29/97	L–23857–15
O–290	1257	9/4/96	
O–290	1326	3/26/97	
O–290–D2	1082	9/26/95	L–6019–21
O–320	1018	2/22/95	
O–320	1024	3/17/95	
O–320	1038	5/13/95	L–39272–27A
O–320	1045	5/24/95	
O–320	1084	9/28/95	
O–320	1116	1/8/95	
O–320	1125	1/8/96	
O–320	1169	2/28/96	
O–320	1175	3/7/96	
O–320	1184	3/28/96	
O–320	1189	8/27/96	
O–320	1202	4/30/96	
O–320	1212	5/10/96	
O–320	1283	10/17/96	
O–320	1316	12/21/96	
O–320	1340	2/25/97	L–24367
O–320	1347	2/18/97	
O–320	1360	3/10/97	
O–320	1361	3/10/97	
O–320	1436	5/29/97	
O–320	1468	8/14/97	
O–320	1474	8/22/97	L–13130–39A
O–320	1477	9/13/97	
O–320	1477	9/13/97	
O–320	1507	11/18/97	
O–320	1519	11/21/97	
O–320	1546	12/7/97	
O–320	1171	3/1/06	
O–320–A	1192	4/13/96	
O–320–A	1194	4/13/96	
O–320–A	1196	4/13/96	
O–320–A1A	1244	8/13/96	L–5270–27
O–320–A2B	1081	9/22/95	
O–320–A2B	1461	9/9/97	L–12626–27
O–320–B2B	1452	7/10/97	L–2977–39
O–320–B2C	1315	12/17/96	
O–320–D2J	1172	3/4/96	L–13039–39A
O–320–D2J	1173	3/7/96	L–123412–39A
O–320–D2J	1253	9/4/96	
O–320–D2J	1534	11/25/97	

TABLE 1—Continued

Engine and model	W/O	Date	Engine Ser. No.
O–320–D2J	1539	12/3/97	
O–320–D3G	1077	9/17/95	
O–320–D3G	1114	1/8/96	L–10983–39A
O–320–D3G	1354	2/25/97	
O–320–D3G	1370	3/26/97	H45247
O–320–D3G	1544	12/3/97	
O–320–E2A	1103	11/10/95	L–26363–27A
O–320–E2A	1191	4/13/96	L–19377–27A
O–320–E2A	1317	12/21/96	L–15219–27A
O–320–E2A	1439	6/9/97	L–38003–55A
O–320–E2D	1068	8/10/95	L–35528–27A
O–320–E2D	1078	9/17/95	
O–320–E2D	1177	3/9/96	L–44732–27A
O–320–E2D	1181	3/14/96	
O–320–E2D	1241	8/9/96	L–42691–27A
O–320–E2D	1245	8/13/96	L–40483–27A
O–320–E2D	1260	9/9/96	L–15300–15
O–320–E2D	1343	2/17/97	
O–320–E2D	1346	3/2/97	L–44320–27A
O–320–E2D	1385	4/16/97	
O–320–E2D	1458	7/18/97	
O–320–E2D	1533	11/25/97	
O–320–E2D	1549	12/12/97	
O–320–E2G	1338	3/10/97	L–38264–27A
O–320–E3D	1034	4/18/95	L–29668–27A
O–320–E3D	1074	8/24/95	L–29495–27A
O–320–E3D	1431	6/9/97	L–33770–27A
O–320–E3D	1444	6/13/97	
O–320–E3D	1500	10/7/97	L–33841–27A
O–320–H2AD	1322	1/22/97	L–1530–78T
O–360	1025	3/17/95	
O–360	1157	2/7/96	
O–360	1199	4/18/96	
O–360	1362	3/10/97	
O–360	1386	4/17/97	
O–360	1394	5/6/97	
O–360	1528	11/19/97	
O–360–A1A	1170	2/28/96	L–20677–36A
O–360–A1A	1214	5/14/96	L–20190–36A
O–360–A1A	1239	8/5/96	
O–360–A1D	1411	5/5/97	
O–360–A3A	1531	11/25/97	
O–360–A4A	1270	9/27/96	L–14008–36A
O–360–A4A	1464	7/30/97	L–24796–36A
O–360–A4A	1486	9/6/97	
O–360–A4A	1529	11/25/97	
O–360–A4K	1166	2/22/96	L–26455–36A
O–360–B1B	1262	9/9/96	L–5261–51A
O–540–A1B5	1129	12/29/95	
O–540–A1B5	1132	1/9/96	L–1165–40
O–540–A1D5	1462	7/28/97	L–5661–40
IO–720	1510	10/26/97	
TIO–540–A2	1064	7/13/95	
TIO–540–A2	1111	1/10/96	
TIO–540–R2AD	1106	11/27/95	L–5949–61A
TCM:			
A–65	1152	1/25/96	
A–65	1154	2/27/96	7187
A–65	1183	2/22/96	
A–65	1185	3/28/96	
A–65	1233	6/23/96	
A–65	1290	10/29/96	
A–65	1296	11/14/96	4933868
A–65	1299	11/19/96	
A–65	1325	3/26/97	
A–65	1326	3/26/97	
A–65	1376	4/29/97	
A–65	1438	6/17/97	5890178
A–65–3	1243	8/13/96	324993
A–65–8	1541	12/2/97	
A–65–8	1276	10/5/96	5762568
A75	1156	2/7/96	5321868

TABLE 1—Continued

Engine and model	W/O	Date	Engine Ser. No.
A75	1255	9/3/96	
A75	1256	9/4/96	
A75–8	1275	10/5/96	5162868
C75–12F	1293	11/4/96	3316–6–12
C85	1088	10/4/95	
C85	1092	10/18/95	
C–85	1198	4/17/96	29652–7–8
C–85	1297	11/14/96	
C–85	1352	3/10/97	
C–85	1381	4/28/97	
C–85	1391	4/19/97	
C–85	1392	4/19/97	
C–85	1484	9/4/97	28487–6–12
C–85–8FJ	1139	1/17/96	29845–7–8
C–85–8FJ	1420	5/12/97	29465–7–8
C–85–12	1031	4/6/95	
C85–12	1182	3/18/96	21596–6–12
C–85–12	1217	5/15/96	
C85–12	1265	9/12/96	14657
C–85–12	1298	11/14/96	23610–6–12
C–90–8F	1471	9/6/97	42838–1–8
C–90–12	1279	10/7/96	44747–6–12
E–185–4	1124	1/16/96	25700D–1–9
E–225–8	1505	10/28/97	35477–D–9–8–P
GTSIO–520	1208	5/7/96	210114–70H
IO–360–C	1126	12/28/95	F–51439–9–C
IO–470	1028	3/23/95	87329–R
IO–470–N	1421	5/13/97	95271–1–N
IO–470–S	1331	3/11/97	102412–2–S–I
IO–520	1174	3/4/96	
IO–520–D	1167	2/22/96	
O–200	1033	4/18/95	
O–200	1043	5/12/95	
O–200	1049	6/2/95	
O–200	1076	9/11/95	214668–27A
O–200	1104	11/21/95	213830–71A
O–200	1131	1/5/96	
O–200	1142	1/18/96	265349–R
O–200	1147	1/23/96	
O–200	1190	4/13/96	
O–200	1193	4/13/96	
O–200	1195	4/13/96	
O–200	1197	4/17/96	
O–200	1213	5/13/96	
O–200	1261	9/9/96	
O–200	1303	12/5/96	
O–200	1321	2/7/97	28115
O–200	1324	2/6/97	
O–200	1344	3/2/97	
O–200	1393	5/5/97	
O–200	1413	5/7/97	61001–5–4
O–200	1430	5/23/97	
O–200	1437	6/17/97	255759A–48
O–200	1488	9/7/97	
O–200	1506	11/18/97	
O–200	1522	11/11/97	
O–200–A	1052	6/21/95	254150–A–48
O–200–A	1085	9/29/95	
O–200–A	1120	12/29/95	253971
O–200–A	1161	2/9/96	24R–469
O–200–A	1215	5/15/96	
O–200–A	1240	8/5/96	69589–8–A
O–200–A	1254	9/3/96	6105–71–A–R
O–200–A	1264	9/12/96	
O–200–A	1356	3/10/97	
O–300	1027	3/20/95	
O–300	1042	5/12/95	34012–D–6–D
O–300	1083	9/26/95	
O–300	1096	10/23/95	464481
O–300	1137	1/17/96	
O–300	1259	9/4/96	
O–300	1387	4/22/97	

TABLE 1—Continued

Engine and model	W/O	Date	Engine Ser. No.
O–300	1397	4/26/97	5928–9A
O–300	1403	4/28/97	
O–300	1423	6/9/97	3834D8Z
O–300	1555	1/13/98	
O–300–A	1446	6/27/97	
O–300–D	1022	3/17/95	35110–D–6–D
O–300–D	1079	9/17/95	24276–D–0–D
O–300–D	1487	9/6/97	
O–300–D	1543	12/3/97	
O–470	1046	6/1/95	
O–470	1383	4/4/97	
O–470–11	1017	2/22/95	
O–470–11	1491	10/19/97	
O–470–11	1492	10/19/97	
O–470–11	1493	10/19/97	
O–470–11	1494	10/19/97	
O–470–F	1236	7/25/96	76956–4–F
O–470–K	1087	10/3/95	47172–6–K
O–470–L	1128	1/10/96	68681–8–L
O–470–L	1359	5/19/97	68245–8–L
O–470–L	1399	4/28/97	
O–470–R	1016	2/10/95	133087–6–R
O–470–R	1086	10/3/95	
O–470–R	1165	2/22/96	
O–470–R	1178	3/10/96	
O–470–R	1201	6/2/96	83164–1–R
O–470–R	1319	1/6/97	459408
TSIO–520–VB	1055	6/9/95	

Note 1: Blank spaces indicate unknown data. Where the engine serial number is blank in this table, it is either unknown or the crankshaft may not be installed in an engine.

Note 2: This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each engine 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 engines 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 (c) 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 crankshaft failure due to cracking, which could result in an inflight engine failure and possible forced landing, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 10 hours time in service after the effective date of this AD, determine if this AD applies, as follows:

(1) Determine if any repair was conducted on the engine that required crankshaft removal during the February 1, 1995, to December 31, 1997, time frame; if the engine was not disassembled for crankshaft removal and repair in this time frame, no further action is required.

(2) If the engine and crankshaft was repaired during this time frame, determine from the maintenance records (engine log book), and Table 1 of this AD if the crankshaft was repaired by Nelson Balancing Service, Repair Station Certificate No. NB7R820J, Bedford, Massachusetts. The maintenance records should contain the Return to Service (Yellow) tag for the crankshaft that will identify the company performing the repair. Also the work order number contained in Table 1 of this AD was etched on the crankshaft propeller flange, adjacent to the closest connecting rod journal. Because some etched numbers will be difficult to see, if necessary, use a 10X magnifying glass with an appropriate light source to view the work order number. In addition, the propeller spinner, if installed, will have to be removed in order to see this number.

(3) A person with a private pilot or higher rated certificate may make the determination of applicability of this AD provided the propeller spinner does not have to be removed.

(4) If it cannot be determined who repaired the crankshaft, compliance with this AD is required.

(5) If the engine and crankshaft were not repaired during the time frame specified in (a)(1), or if it is determined that the crankshaft was not repaired by Nelson Balancing Service, no further action is required.

(b) Within 10 hours time in service after the effective date of this AD, accomplish the following:

(1) Perform a visual inspection as defined in paragraph (b)(2) of this AD, magnetic particle inspection, and a dimensional check of the crankshaft journals, or remove from service affected crankshafts and replace with serviceable parts.

(2) For the purpose of this AD, a visual inspection of the crankshaft is defined as the inspection of all surfaces of the crankshaft for cracks which include heat check cracking of the nitrided bearing surfaces, cracking in the main or aft fillet of the main bearing journal and crankpin journal, including checking the bearing surfaces for scoring, galling, corrosion, or pitting.

Note 3: Further guidance on all inspection and acceptance criteria is contained in applicable TCM or LYC Overhaul or Maintenance Manuals, or other FAA-approved data.

(3) Replace any crankshaft that fails the visual inspection, magnetic particle inspection, or the dimensional check with a serviceable crankshaft, unless the crankshaft can be reworked to bring it in compliance with:

(i) All the overhaul requirements of the appropriate TCM or LYC Overhaul/Maintenance Manuals; or

(ii) All of the FAA-approved requirements for any repair station which currently has approval for limits other than those in the appropriate TCM or LYC Overhaul/Maintenance Manuals.

(4) For the purpose of this AD, a serviceable crankshaft is one which meets the requirements of paragraph (b)(3)(i) or (b)(3)(ii) of this AD.

Note 4: Crankshafts removed from TCM engine models IO–360, IO–520, and TSIO–520 series engines are also subject to compliance with AD 97–26–17.

(c) 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, New York (LYC) or Atlanta (TCM) Aircraft Certification Offices. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Airworthiness Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York or Atlanta Aircraft Certification Offices.

Note 5: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Atlanta Aircraft Certification or New York Aircraft Certification Office, as applicable.

(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 aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on October 19, 1998.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on August 11, 1998.

Jay J. Pardee,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–22240 Filed 8–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–SW–36–AD; Amendment 39–10716; AD 98–16–02]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA 3180, SA 318B, SA 318C, SE 3130, SE 313B, SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This document publishes in the **Federal Register** an amendment adopting Airworthiness Directive (AD) 98–16–02 which was sent previously to all known U.S. owners and operators of Eurocopter France Model SA 3180, SA 318B, SA 318C, SE 3130, SE 313B, SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 helicopters by individual letters. This AD requires an initial and recurring visual inspections of the upper and lower surfaces of the tail rotor blade (blade) skin for cracks. If a crack is found, replacing the blade with an airworthy blade is required. This amendment is prompted by a report of a crack on the blade skin near an attachment bolt on the blade cuff stem. This condition, if not corrected, could result in fatigue failure of a blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter.

DATES: Effective September 4, 1998, to all persons except those persons to whom it was made immediately effective by priority letter AD 98–16–02, issued on July 22, 1998, which contained the requirements of this amendment.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before October 19, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–SW–36–AD, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Room 663, Fort Worth, Texas 76137.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Shep Blackman, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Rotorcraft Directorate, Rotorcraft Standards Staff, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, Texas 76137, telephone (817) 222–5296, fax (817) 222–5961.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 22, 1998, the FAA issued priority letter AD 98–16–02, applicable to Eurocopter France Model SA 3180, SA 318B, SA 318C, SE 3130, SE 313B, SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 helicopters, which requires, within 10 hours time-in-service (TIS), and thereafter, at intervals not to exceed 10 hours TIS, visually inspecting the blade skin near the attachment bolts on the blade cuff stem for cracks on the upper and lower surfaces using an 8-power or higher magnifying glass. If a crack is found, replacing the blade with an airworthy blade is necessary. That action was prompted by a report of a crack on the lower surface of the blade skin near an attachment bolt on the blade cuff stem. This condition, if not corrected, could result in fatigue failure of a blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter.

The FAA has reviewed Eurocopter France Service Telexes No. 05.36, No. 05.94, and No. 05.95, as transmitted by Information Telex 00068, dated July 10, 1998, which describes procedures for visually checking the blade skin for cracks using an 8-power magnifying glass.

These helicopter models are manufactured in France and are 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 airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of these type designs that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since the unsafe condition described is likely to exist or develop on other Eurocopter France Model SA 3180, SA 318B, SA 318C, SE 3130, SE 313B, SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 helicopters of the same type design, the FAA issued priority letter AD 98–16–02 to prevent fatigue failure of a blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter. The AD requires, within 10 hours time-in-service (TIS), and thereafter, at intervals not to exceed 10 hours TIS, visually inspecting the blade skin near the attachment bolts on the blade cuff stem for cracks on the upper and lower surfaces using an 8-power or higher magnifying glass. If a crack is found, replacing the blade with an airworthy blade is necessary.

Since it was found that immediate corrective action was required, notice and opportunity for prior public comment thereon were impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and good cause existed to make the AD effective immediately by individual letters issued on July 22, 1998 to all known U.S. owners and operators of Eurocopter France Model SA 3180, SA 318B, SA 318C, SE 3130, SE 313B, SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 helicopters. These conditions still exist, and the AD is hereby published in the **Federal Register** as an amendment to section 39.13 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 39.13) to make it effective to all persons.

The FAA estimates that 106 helicopters of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 1 work hour per helicopter to inspect each blade and 3 work hours to replace it, if necessary, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts will cost approximately $8780 per blade. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $956,120, assuming one blade replacement for each helicopter.

Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on this rule. Interested persons are invited to comment on this rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire.