

29003, Phoenix, AZ 85038-9003; telephone (602) 365-2493, fax (602) 365-5577. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on November 12, 1996.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on August 26, 1996.

Jay J. Pardee,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-22772 Filed 9-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-10-AD; Amendment 39-9744; AD 96-18-18]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all Airbus Model A300-600 series airplanes, that requires inspections to detect cracking of the upper radius of the forward fitting of frame 47, and repair, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by results of full-scale fatigue testing, which revealed cracking in the upper radius of frame 47. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of frame 47 of the fuselage.

DATES: Effective October 16, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 16, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Huber, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate,

1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-2589; fax (206) 227-1149.

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 all Airbus Model A300-600 series airplanes was published in the Federal Register on July 1, 1996 (61 FR 33874). That action proposed to require repetitive eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the upper radius of the left and right forward fitting of frame 47, and repair, if necessary.

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

The commenter supports the proposed rule.

Conclusion

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

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 35 Airbus Model A300-600 series airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 4 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$8,400, or \$240 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44

FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A 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, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

96-18-18 Airbus Industrie: Amendment 39-9744. Docket 96-NM-10-AD.

Applicability: All Model A300-600 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Note 1: 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 (b) 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 reduced structural integrity of frame 47 of the fuselage, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 17,300 total landings, or within one year after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later: Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the upper radius of the left and right forward fitting of frame 47, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-6029, Revision 2, dated November 7, 1994.

(1) If no cracking is found during an eddy current inspection: Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 6,600 landings.

(2) If any cracking is found during an eddy current inspection: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(b) 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, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(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) The inspection shall be done in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-6029, Revision 2, dated November 7, 1994, which contains the following list of effective pages:

Page No.	Revision level shown on page	Date shown on page
1-3	2	Nov. 7, 1994.
4-6	1	Feb. 23, 1994.
7-22	Original	Aug. 23, 1993.

This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on October 16, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 29, 1996.

Bill Boxwell,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-22599 Filed 9-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-ANE-30; Amendment 39-9738; AD 96-18-14]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller Inc. HC-A3V, HC-B3M, HC-B3T, HC-B4M, HC-B4T, and HC-B5M Series Propellers

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to Hartzell Propeller Inc. (Hartzell) HC-A3V, HC-B3M, HC-B3T, HC-B4M, HC-B4T, and HC-B5M series propellers, that requires hub replacement over a 10-year time period with a concurrent blade and blade clamp inspection. This amendment is prompted by reports of two propeller hub failures and one crack indication that occurred on Mitsubishi MU-2B-60 aircraft, the similarity of construction and load transfer paths between the Hartzell propeller models installed on the Mitsubishi MU-2 aircraft and Hartzell's 3, 4, and 5-bladed steel hub propeller models, several blade shank failures, and reports of cracks in blade clamps. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent propeller hub, blade, or blade clamp failure, which can result in loss of aircraft control.

DATES: Effective October 16, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 16, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Hartzell Propeller Inc., One Propeller Place, Piqua, OH 45356-2634, ATTN: Product Support; telephone (513) 778-4388, fax (513) 778-4321. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tomaso DiPaolo, Aerospace Engineer, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 2300 East Devon Ave., Des Plaines, IL 60018; telephone (847) 294-7031, fax (847) 294-7834.

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 Hartzell Propeller Inc. (Hartzell) HC-A3V, HC-B3M, HC-B3T, HC-B4M, HC-B4T, and HC-B5M series propellers was published in the Federal Register on April 26, 1996 (61 FR 18520). That action proposed to require over a 10-year time period, propeller hub replacement with a concurrent blade and blade clamp inspection for Hartzell Propeller Inc. Models HC-A3VF-70, HC-B3TF-70, HC-B3MN-30, HC-B3TN-20, HC-B3TN-30, HC-B3TN-50, HC-B4MN-50, HC-B4MP-30, HC-B4TN-30, HC-B4TN-50, HC-B5MA-30, HC-B5MP-30, HC-B5MP-50, HC-B3MN-50, HC-B3TN-40, HC-B4MP-40, and HC-B5MN-30 propellers.

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

Commenters state that the AD should be modified to limit the affected propellers to those installed on engine types similar to those in Mitsubishi MU-2 aircraft. The commenters also state that their service history has shown that this engine type has more problems and that the NPRM documents that only propellers on the Mitsubishi MU-2 aircraft have been found with cracked hubs. The FAA does not concur. Regardless of engine types, the 3, 4, and 5-bladed hubs have similar loading and load paths to the failed propellers and, in addition, could contain characteristics that the FAA has determined can cause a reduction in hub fatigue strength. The NTSB has also recommended addressing the same hub fatigue strength characteristics for the 3, 4, and 5-bladed hubs. This hub replacement program will provide the following hub fatigue strength improvements: (1) Improved hub metallurgy; (2) Elimination of any surface decarburization in the pilot tube bore; (3) Introduction of compressive residual stress in the pilot tube bore; (4) Improved corrosion protection in the pilot tube bore; and (5) Improved surface finish in the pilot tube bore.

Additionally, the commenters state that the cost of complying with the proposed AD is severely understated and will increase overhaul costs. Therefore, they imply that the proposed AD should be withdrawn or limited in scope. The FAA does not concur. The costs documented in the AD are weighted average costs. For example, individual operators with five-bladed propellers will have costs that run higher than the weighted average costs. Therefore, the costs stated in the AD