Procedures or Emergency Procedures Section of the applicable FAA-approved AFM or POH to include a paragraph relating to a non-responsive power lever. In addition, this proposal would require replacing orifice fittings and reworking restrictors, which would constitute terminating action to the requirement to revise the applicable AFM or POH. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service documents described previously.

There are approximately 9,438 engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 4,700 engines installed on aircraft of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. The FAA estimates that 2,760 engines would need modification in accordance with SB No. TPE331–73–0236, dated July 28, 1995, that it would take approximately 2 work hours per engine to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $80 per engine.

In addition, the FAA estimates that 1,240 engines would need modification in accordance with SB No. TPE331–73–0235, dated July 28, 1995, that it would take approximately 3 work hours per engine to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $80 per engine. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $874,400.

The regulations proposed herein would 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 proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this 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) if promulgated, 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 draft regulatory 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, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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:

AlliedSignal Inc.: Docket No. 96–ANE–13.

Applicability: AlliedSignal Inc. TPE331–3, –5, –6, –10, –11, –12 series turboprop engines equipped with Woodward fuel controls, installed on but not limited to the following aircraft: Ayres S2R–G5, S2R–G6, and S2R–G10; Beech Model B100; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA) C–212 series; Dornier 228 series; Fairchild SA226 and SA227 series; Jetstream 3101 and 3201 series; Mitsubishi MU–2B series (MU–2 series); Short Brothers plc Model SC–7 Skyvan Series 3; Twin Commander Aircraft Corp. 680, 690 and 695 series.

Note: 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 (d) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent a non-responsive power lever and lack of control of engine power, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, for aircraft equipped with engine inlet ice protection, revise the applicable Emergency Procedures or Abnormal Procedures Section of the applicable FAA-approved Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) or Pilot's Operating Handbook (POH) to include the following paragraph relating to a non-responsive power lever. This may be accomplished by inserting a copy of this AD in the AFM or POH:

''NON-RESPONSIVE POWER LEVER: If a lack of response to the power lever is observed, turn ON the ignition and engine anti-ice for both engines. After the condition has cleared and normal operation is observed, which occurs in approximately three minutes, anti-ice and ignition can be turned OFF.''

(b) Within 120 days after the effective date of this AD, or at next removal of the Pt2 sensor, whichever occurs first, replace or rework orifice fittings and restrictors in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of AlliedSignal Aerospace Service Bulletin (SB), No. TPE331–73–0235, dated July 28, 1995. Replacing the orifice fittings and reworking the inlet sensor Ps3 restrictor constitutes terminating action to the AFM or POH revision requirement stated in paragraph (a) of this AD.

(c) Within 120 days after the effective date of this AD, or at next removal of the Pt2 sensor, whichever occurs first, replace the orifice fittings in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of AlliedSignal Aerospace SB No. TPE331–73–0236, dated July 28, 1995. Replacing orifice fittings constitutes terminating action to the AFM or POH revision requirement stated in paragraph (a) of this AD.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office. The request should be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office.

Note: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office.

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

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on September 19, 1996.

James C. Jones,

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

[FR Doc. 96–25170 Filed 10–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 93–CE–45–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives, de Havilland DHC–6 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive

(AD) that would apply to de Havilland DHC–6 series airplanes that do not have a certain wing strut modification (Modification 6/1581) incorporated. The proposed action would require inspecting the wing struts for cracks or damage (chafing, etc.), replacing wings struts that are found damaged beyond certain limits or are found cracked, and incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 to prevent future chafing damage. Several reports of wing strut damage caused by the upper fairing rubbing against the wing strut prompted the proposed action. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent failure of the wing struts, which could result in loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: Commens must be received on or before December 5, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 93–CE–45–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from de Havilland, Inc., 123 Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario, Canada, M3K 1Y5. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

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:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 93–CE–45–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 93–CE–45–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

Transport Canada, which is the airworthiness authority for Canada, has notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on de Havilland DHC–6 series airplanes. Transport Canada reports that the upper fairing has rubbed against the wing struts on several of the above referenced airplanes, which has resulted in wing strut damage.

Explanation of the Relevant Service Information

De Havilland has issued Service Bulletin (SB) No. 6/342, dated February 23, 1976, which specifies procedures for (1) inspecting the wing struts for cracks and damage (chafing, etc.); and (2) incorporating Modification No. 6/1581 to prevent further chafing damage. 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. Transport Canada classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued Transport Canada AD CF–91–30, dated August 8, 1991, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in Canada.

Evaluation of all Applicable Information

This airplane model is manufactured in Canada 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 airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, Transport Canada has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of Transport Canada; reviewed all available information, including the service information referenced above; and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Explanation of the Provisions of the Proposed AD

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other de Havilland DHC–6 series airplanes of the same type design that do not have Modification 6/1581 incorporated, the proposed AD would 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. Accomplishment of the proposed inspection and modification would be required in accordance with de Havilland SB No. 6/342, dated February 23, 1976.

FAA's Aging Commuter Aircraft Policy

This action is consistent with the FAA/s aging commuter airplane policy. This policy simply states that reliance on repetitive inspection 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 inspection to detect damaged wing struts.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 169 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 8 workhours per airplane to accomplish the proposed 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 proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $106,470. This figure is based upon the assumption 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. Assuming that each set of parts is incorporated on an effected 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 proposed herein would 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 proposal would 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) if promulgated, 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 draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action has been placed 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, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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 to read as follows:

de Havilland: 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 closet 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, 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, but does not exceed 0.25-inch in depth, does not exceed a total length of 5 inches, and where any two places of damage are separate 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) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the document referred to herein upon request to de Havilland, Inc., 123 Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario M3K 1Y5 Canada; or may examine this document at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on September 26, 1996.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–25304 Filed 10–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–78–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Boeing Model 727 series airplanes. This proposal would require a one-time visual inspection of the manual extension gearbox assembly of the main landing gear (MLG) to detect whether certain gearbox housings have been installed; repetitive dye penetrant inspections of these housings to determine whether cracking has occurred; and ultimately, replacement of these housings with correct housings. This proposal is prompted by a report indicating that a manual gearbox assembly which contained an incorrect housing was installed on a Model 727 series airplane. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent the installation of manual extension gearbox assemblies with incorrect housings. This condition, if not corrected, could reduce the structural integrity of the manual extension gearbox assembly, and ultimately result in an inability to lock the MLG in a down position during landing.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation