

| Actions | Compliance | Procedures |
|--|--|---|
| (1) For affected airplanes with a manufacturer serial number (MSN) of 489 or lower, check the airplane logbook to determine if the inboard and outboard flap flexshafts have been replaced with P/N 945.02.02.205 and P/N 945.02.02.206. | Within the next 30 days after the effective date of this AD. | The owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7) may perform this check. |
| (2) For affected airplanes with a MSN of 490 and above, check the airplane logbook to determine if the inboard and outboard flap flexshafts, P/N 945.02.02.205 and P/N 945.02.02.206 have been replaced since delivery. | Within the next 30 days after the effective date of this AD. | The owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7) may perform this check. |
| (3) If you can positively determine that both inboard and outboard flap flexshafts, P/Ns 945.02.02.205 and 945.02.02.206 are installed, no replacement is required. | Not applicable | Not applicable. |
| (4) If you cannot positively determine that both inboard and outboard flap flexshafts, P/N 945.02.02.205 and P/N 945.02.02.206 are installed, you must replace either one or both with P/N 945.02.02.205 and P/N 945.02.02.206, as applicable. | Before further flight after the logbook checks required in paragraph (e)(1) and (e)(2) of this AD. | Follow Pilatus PC12 Service Bulletin No. 27-015 as specified in paragraph (f) of this AD. |
| (5) Install only inboard and outboard flap flexshafts, P/Ns 945.02.02.205 and 945.02.02.206. | As of the effective date of this AD | Not applicable. |

What Revision Levels do the Affected Service Bulletin Incorporate?

(f) The service bulletin required to do the actions required in this AD incorporate the following pages:

| Affected pages | Revision level | Date |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 and 2 | A | November 13, 2003. |
| 3 through 11 | Original Issue | June 4, 2003. |

May I Request an Alternative Method of Compliance?

(g) You may request a different method of compliance or a different compliance time for this AD by following the procedures in 14 CFR 39.19. Unless FAA authorizes otherwise, send your request to your principal inspector. The principal inspector may add comments and will send your request to the Manager, Standards Office, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA. For information on any already approved alternative methods of compliance, contact Doug Rudolph, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4059; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

May I Get Copies of the Documents Referenced in This AD?

(h) You may get copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Pilatus Aircraft Ltd., Customer Liaison Manager, CH-6371 Stans, Switzerland; telephone: +41 41 619 6208; facsimile: +41 41 619 7311; e-mail: SupportPC12@pilatus-aircraft.com or from Pilatus Business Aircraft Ltd., Product Support Department, 11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado 80021; telephone: (303)

465-9099; facsimile: (303) 465-6040. You may view these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Is There Other Information That Relates to This Subject?

(i) Swiss AD Number HB-2004-068, dated March 4, 2004, also addresses the subject of this AD.

Issued in Kansas City, on April 1, 2004.

David R. Showers,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 04-8054 Filed 4-8-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4916-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa "PZL-Bielsko" Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" Sailplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa "PZL-Bielsko" (PZL-Bielsko) Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" sailplanes. This proposed AD would require you to inspect the

airbrake torque tube for cracks, distortion, and corrosion (herein referred to as damage). This proposed AD would also require you to replace or repair any damaged airbrake torque tube. This proposed AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Poland. We are issuing this proposed AD to detect and correct damage on the airbrake torque tube, which could result in failure of the airbrake system. This failure could lead to loss of control of the sailplane.

DATES: We must receive any comments on this proposed AD by May 9, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following to submit comments on this proposed AD:

- *By mail:* FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

- *By fax:* (816) 329-3771.

- *By e-mail:* 9-ACE-7-

Docket@faa.gov. Comments sent electronically must contain "Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD" in the subject line. If you send comments electronically as attached electronic files, the files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII.

You may get the service information identified in this proposed AD from Allstar PZL Glider Sp. z o.o., ul. Cieszyńska 325, 43-300 Bielsko-Biala.

You may view the AD docket at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Office hours are 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Greg Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4130; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

How do I comment on this proposed AD? We invite you to submit any written relevant data, views, or arguments regarding this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include "AD Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD" in the subject line of your comments. If you want us to acknowledge receipt of your mailed comments, send us a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the docket

number written on it. We will date-stamp your postcard and mail it back to you.

Are there any specific portions of this proposed AD I should pay attention to? We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. If you contact us through a nonwritten communication and that contact relates to a substantive part of this proposed AD, we will summarize the contact and place the summary in the docket. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD in light of those comments and contacts.

Discussion

What events have caused this proposed AD? The General Inspectorate of Civil Aviation (GICA), which is the airworthiness authority for Poland, recently notified FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all PZL-Bielsko Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" sailplanes. The GICA reports several instances of the airbrake torque tube breaking and separating from the fuselage during flight, which makes it impossible to retract the airbrake.

An investigation revealed damage at the welded joint between the airbrake torque tube and the fuselage. The damage was caused by material fatigue due to frequent striking load that exceeds the recommended allowances and/or corrosion.

What are the consequences if the condition is not corrected? This condition, if not detected and corrected, could cause the airbrake system to fail. Failure of the airbrake system could result in loss of control of the sailplane.

Is there service information that applies to this subject? Allstar PZL Glider Sp. Z o.o. has issued Mandatory Bulletin No. BE-052/SZD-50-3/2003 "Puchacz", dated July 22, 2003.

What are the provisions of this service information? The service bulletin includes procedures for:

- Inspecting the airbrake torque tube for crack, distortion, and corrosion (damage); and
- Replacing or repairing any damaged airbrake torque tube.

What action did the GICA take? The GICA classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued Republic of Poland AD Number SP-0052-2003-A, dated July 22, 2003, to ensure the continued airworthiness of these sailplanes in Poland.

Did the GICA inform the United States under the bilateral airworthiness agreement? These PZL-Bielsko Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" sailplanes are manufactured in Poland and are type-certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of § 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement.

Under this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the GICA has kept us informed of the situation described above.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This Proposed AD

What has FAA decided? We have examined the GICA's findings, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop on other PZL-Bielsko Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" sailplanes of the same type design that are registered in the United States, we are proposing AD action to detect and correct damage in the airbrake torque tube, which could result in failure of the airbrake system. This failure could lead to loss of control of the sailplane.

What would this proposed AD require? This proposed AD would require you to incorporate the actions in the previously-referenced service bulletin.

How does the revision to 14 CFR part 39 affect this proposed AD? On July 10, 2002, we published a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs FAA's AD system. This regulation now includes material that relates to altered products, special flight permits, and alternative methods of compliance. This material previously was included in each individual AD. Since this material is included in 14 CFR part 39, we will not include it in future AD actions.

Costs of Compliance

How many sailplanes would this proposed AD impact? We estimate that this proposed AD affects 8 sailplanes in the U.S. registry.

What would be the cost impact of this proposed AD on owners/operators of the affected sailplanes? We estimate the following costs to accomplish this proposed inspection:

| Labor cost | Parts cost | Total cost per sailplane | Total cost on U.S. operators |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 5 workhours × \$65 per hour = \$325 | Not applicable | \$325 | \$2,600 |

We estimate the following costs to accomplish any necessary replacements that would be required based on the

results of this proposed inspection. We have no way of determining the number

of sailplanes that may need this replacement:

| Labor cost | Parts cost | Total cost per sailplane |
|---|------------|--------------------------|
| 5 workhours × \$65 per hour = \$325 | \$294 | \$325 + \$294 = \$619. |

Regulatory Findings

Would this proposed AD impact various entities? 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.

Would this proposed AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action? For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed AD:

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 summary of the costs to comply with this proposed AD and placed it in the AD Docket. You may get

a copy of this summary by sending a request to us at the address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include "AD Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD" in your request.

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 airworthiness directive (AD):

Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa "PZL-Bielsko": Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD

When Is the Last Date I Can Submit Comments on This Proposed AD?

- (a) We must receive comments on this proposed airworthiness directive (AD) by May 9, 2004.

What Other ADs Are Affected by This Action?

- (b) None.

What Sailplanes Are Affected by This AD?

- (c) This AD affects Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" sailplanes, all serial numbers, that are certificated in any category.

What Is the Unsafe Condition Presented in This AD?

- (d) This AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Poland. We are issuing this proposed AD to detect and correct cracks in the airbrake torque tube, which could result in failure of the airbrake system. This failure could lead to loss of control of the sailplane.

What Must I Do To Address This Problem?

- (e) To address this problem, you must do the following:

| Actions | Compliance | Procedures |
|--|---|--|
| (1) Using a fluorescent dye-penetrant or dye-check method, inspect the airbrake torque tube for cracks and corrosion pits. Visually inspect for permanent distortions and surface corrosion (damage). | Within the next 25 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD. Repetitively inspect thereafter at intervals not to exceed 12 calendar months or 100 hours TIS, whichever occurs later. | Follow Allstar PZL Glider Sp. Z o.o. Mandatory Bulletin No. BE-052/SZD-50-3/2003 "Puchacz", dated July 22, 2003. |
| (2) Based on the results of the inspection: | Prior to further flight after the inspection in which the damage is found. Continue with the repetitive inspections required in paragraph (e)(1) of this AD after each repair or replacement is made. | Follow Allstar PZL Glider Sp. Z o.o. Mandatory Bulletin No. BE-052/SZD-50-3/2003 "Puchacz", dated July 22, 2003. |
| (a) Repair the airbrake torque tube if slight, uniform corrosive deposits are found during the inspection required in paragraph (e)(1) of this AD by removing the corrosive deposits with a fine abrasive paper; and | | |
| (b) Replace the airbrake torque tube if any other damage is found during the inspection required in paragraph (e)(1) of this AD. | | |

May I Request an Alternative Method of Compliance?

- (f) You may request a different method of compliance or a different compliance time for this AD by following the procedures in 14 CFR 39.19. Unless FAA authorizes otherwise, send your request to your principal

inspector. The principal inspector may add comments and will send your request to the Manager, Standards Office, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA. For information on any already approved alternative methods of compliance, contact Greg Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate,

901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4130; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

May I Get Copies of the Documents Referenced in This AD?

(g) You may get copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Allstar PZL Glider Sp. z o.o., ul. Cieszyńska, 43-300 Bielsko-Biala. You may view these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Is There Other Information That Relates to This Subject?

(h) Republic of Poland AD Number SP-0052-2003-A, dated July 22, 2003.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on April 2, 2004.

Dorenda D. Baker,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 04-8055 Filed 4-8-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2004-CE-05-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-401, AT-401B, AT-402, AT-402A, AT-402B, AT-501, AT-502, AT-502A, AT-502B, AT-503A, AT-602, AT-802, and AT-802A Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to supersede Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2002-19-10, which applies to certain Air Tractor, Inc. (Air Tractor) Models AT-402, AT-402A, AT-402B, AT-602, AT-802, and AT-802A airplanes. AD 2002-19-10 currently requires you to repetitively inspect the upper longeron and upper diagonal tube on the left hand side of the aft fuselage structure for cracks and contact the manufacturer for a repair scheme if cracks are found. This proposed AD is the result of reports of the same cracks recently found on AT-500 series airplanes. The manufacturer has also issued new and revised service information that incorporates a modification to terminate the repetitive inspection requirements. Consequently, this proposed AD would retain the inspection actions required in AD 2002-19-10, would add certain AT-500 series airplanes to the applicability section, would change the compliance times, and would incorporate new and revised manufacturer service information that contains a terminating

action for the repetitive inspection requirement. We are issuing this proposed AD to detect and correct cracks in the upper aft longeron, which could cause the fuselage to fail. Such failure could result in loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: We must receive any comments on this proposed AD by June 7, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following to submit comments on this proposed AD:

- *By mail:* FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2004-CE-05-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

- *By fax:* (816) 329-3771.

- *By e-mail:* 9-ACE-7-

Docket@faa.gov. Comments sent electronically must contain "Docket No. 2004-CE-05-AD" in the subject line. If you send comments electronically as attached electronic files, the files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII.

You may get the service information identified in this proposed AD from Air Tractor, Incorporated, P.O. Box 485, Olney, Texas 76374.

You may view the AD docket at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2004-CE-05-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Office hours are 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew D. McAnaul, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Fort Worth Airplane Certification Office (ACO), 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76193-0150. Current duty station: San Antonio Manufacturing Inspection District Office (MIDO), 10100 Reunion Place, Suite 650, San Antonio, Texas 78216; telephone: (210) 308-3365; facsimile: (210) 308-3370.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

How do I comment on this proposed AD? We invite you to submit any written relevant data, views, or arguments regarding this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include "AD Docket No. 2004-CE-05-AD" in the subject line of your comments. If you want us to acknowledge receipt of your mailed comments, send us a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the docket number written on it. We will date-stamp your postcard and mail it back to you.

Are there any specific portions of this proposed AD I should pay attention to? We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic,

environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. If you contact us through a nonwritten communication and that contact relates to a substantive part of this proposed AD, we will summarize the contact and place the summary in the docket. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD in light of those comments and contacts.

Discussion

Has FAA taken any action to this point? We received reports of cracks found on the left hand upper longeron and upper diagonal support tubes where they intersect on the left hand side of the fuselage frame just forward of the vertical fin front spar attachment point on Air Tractor Model AT-602 airplanes. Additional cracking was later reported on AT-400, AT-602, and AT-802 series airplanes.

Air Tractor started installing extended reinforcement gussets on AT-402 and AT-802 series airplanes at the factory to alleviate the crack condition from occurring. The extended reinforcement gussets were intended to transfer the loads away from the joint. However, an AT-802 airplane with the extended reinforcement gusset installed during factory production was discovered cracked in service at the forward end of the gusset.

These conditions caused us to issue AD 2002-19-10, Amendment 39-12890 (67 FR 61481, October 1, 2002). AD 2002-19-10 currently requires you to do the following on certain Air Tractor Models AT-402, AT-402A, AT-402B, AT-602, AT-802, and AT-802A airplanes:

- Repetitively inspect the upper longeron and upper diagonal tube on the left hand side of the aft fuselage structure for cracks; and
- Contact the manufacturer for a repair scheme if cracks are found.

What has happened since AD 2002-19-10 to initiate this proposed action? We have received additional reports of the same cracks found on an Air Tractor Model AT-502 and AT-502A airplane.

The manufacturer has also issued new and revised service information. The new service information contains procedures for replacing and modifying the upper aft longeron as a terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement.

What is the potential impact if FAA took no action? This condition, if not detected and corrected, could cause the fuselage to fail. Such failure could result in loss of control of the airplane.

Is there service information that applies to this subject? Snow