of Fokker Service Bulletin Change Notification SBF100–27–069/01, dated January 8, 1996; and Part B of the Accomplishment Instructions of Menasco Aerospace Ltd. Service Bulletin 23100–27–19, dated November 10, 1995.

(2) If any cracking or failure is detected, prior to further flight, replace the discrepant bolt with a serviceable bolt, apply corrosion protection to each serviceable bolt, and reassemble and identify the HSCU, in accordance with Part 2 of the Accomplishment Instructions of Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100–27–069, dated January 1, 1996, as revised by Part 2 of Fokker Service Bulletin Change Notification SBF100–27–069/01, dated January 8, 1996; and Part B of the Accomplishment Instructions of Menasco Aerospace Ltd. Service Bulletin 23100–27–19, dated November 10, 1995.

(c) For airplanes having serial numbers 11500, 11505, and 11511: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, reidentify the HSCU in accordance with Part 3 of the Accomplishment Instructions of Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100–27–069, dated January 1, 1996.

(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, 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.

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

(f) The actions shall be done in accordance with Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100–27–069, dated January 1, 1996, as revised by Fokker Service Bulletin Change Notification SBF100–27–069/01, dated January 8, 1996; and Menasco Aerospace Ltd. Service Bulletin 23100–27–19, dated November 10, 1995. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register n accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Fokker Services B.V., Technical Support Department, P.O. Box 75047, 1117 ZN Schiphol Airport, The Netherlands. 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.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on August 1, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on June 13, 1997.

S.R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–16103 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–ANE–24–AD; Amendment 39–10054; AD 97–13–07]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard 54H60 Series Propellers

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Hamilton Standard 54H60 series propellers. This action requires removing from service affected propeller blades, and returning those blades to the manufacturer or an approved facility for inspection, rework, and return to service. This amendment is prompted by reports of a propeller blade manufacturing defect. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent propeller blade fracture due to the manufacturing defect, which could result in propeller blade separation and loss of control of the aircraft.

DATES: Effective July 14, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of July 14, 1997.

Comments for inclusion in the rules docket must be received on or before August 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–ANE–24–AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: ''9-ad-engineprop@faa.dot.gov''. Comments sent via the Internet must contain the docket number in the subject line.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Hamilton Standard, Attn: Publications Mail Stop 6–B12, One Hamilton Rd., Windsor Locks, CT 06096–1010; telephone (860) 654–6876, fax (860) 654–6906. This information may be examined 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Walsh, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (617) 238–7158, fax (617) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has received reports of a propeller blade fracture and subsequent blade departure on a Hamilton Standard Model 54H60–111 propeller installed on a military Lockheed Martin KC–130 aircraft. Propellers with the same or similar design are installed on many civil aircraft. The crack initiated in the beveled radius of the blade root. The investigation revealed that the propeller blades were manufactured during the fourth quarter of 1983 when a possible random deficiency cold rolling intensity occurred. Further investigation revealed that this manufacturing defect may exist for a larger propeller blade population than those propellers originally inspected in accordance with Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 54H60–61–A125, dated May 23, 1990. This condition, if not corrected, could result in propeller blade fracture due to the manufacturing defect, which could result in propeller blade separation and loss of control of the aircraft.

The FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 54H60–61–A133, Revision 1, dated May 29, 1997, that lists serial numbers of affected propeller blades, and describes procedures for removing from service affected propeller blades, and returning those blades to the manufacturer or an approved repair facility for return to service. The FAA is concerned with the structural integrity of certain propeller blades in the suspect population, identified in that SB, with propeller repair records indicating that the beveled radius was recut and cold rolled at a repair facility as the result of repair of the beveled radius area of the blade root. The recutting and cold rolling repair procedure may mask damage and permit the blade to be acceptable with the inspection method specified in this AD. These propeller blades must be retained

at the repair facility and further inspected by a more extensive inspection procedure now under development. These propeller blades may only be returned to service when this more extensive inspection procedure and subsequent repair is approved by the FAA.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other propellers of the same type design, this AD is being issued to prevent propeller blade fracture. This AD requires removing from service affected propeller blades, and returning those blades to the manufacturer or an approved facility for inspection, rework, and return to service. The actions are required to be accomplished in accordance with the ASB described previously.

Since a situation exists that requires the immediate adoption of this regulation, it is found that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

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. Communications should identify the rules docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES.** All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered, and this rule may be amended in light of the comments received. Factual information that supports the commenter's ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the AD action and determining whether additional rulemaking action would be needed.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify the 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 AD 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 Number 97–ANE–24–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

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.

The FAA has determined that this regulation is an emergency regulation that must be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft, and is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866.

It has been determined further that this action involves an emergency regulation under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). If it is determined that this emergency regulation otherwise would be significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, a final regulatory evaluation will be prepared and placed in the rules docket. A copy of it, if filed, 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:

97–13–07 Hamilton Standard: Amendment 39–10054. Docket 97–ANE–24–AD.

Applicability: Hamilton Standard Models 54H60–77, –91, –111, –117, –123, and –125 propellers, with serial numbers listed in Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 54H60–61–A133, Revision 1, dated May 29, 1997. These propellers are installed on but not limited to Lockheed Martin C–130, C–130A, 382 series, L–100 series, L–188 series; Aero Space Lines Model 3775GT, and Lockheed Martin (Convair) CV580 series aircraft.

Note 1: This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each propeller 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 propellers 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 propeller blade fracture due to a manufacturing defect, which could result in propeller blade separation and loss of control of the aircraft, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 50 hours time in service after the effective date of this AD, remove from service affected propeller blades, and return those blades to the manufacturer or an approved facility for inspection, rework, and return to service, in accordance with Hamilton Standard ASB No. 54H60–61–A133, Revision 1, dated May 29, 1997.

(b) Those propeller blades that had the beveled radius recut and cold rolled at an FAA approved repair facility in accordance with the reference maintenance documents and cannot be returned to service at this time. Inspection and repair procedures are currently under development.

(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, Boston Aircraft Certification Office. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Boston Aircraft Certification Office.

(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) The actions required by this AD shall be done in accordance with the following Hamilton Standard ASB:

Document No.	Pages	Revi-sion	Date
54H60–61–A133 ..... Total Pages: 9.	1–9	1	May 29, 1997.

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 Hamilton Standard, Attn: Publications Mail Stop 6–B12, One Hamilton Rd., Windsor Locks, CT 06096–1010; telephone (860) 654–6876, fax (860) 654–6906. 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.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on July 28, 1997.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on June 13, 1997.

Jay J. Pardee,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–16281 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–ANE–38; Amendment 39–10057; AD 97–13–10]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Aircraft Engines CF700 Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to General Electric Aircraft Engines CF700 series turbofan engines, that requires replacement of existing fan guards with new, improved fan guards. This amendment is prompted by a report of uncontained fan blades which separated from the engine during an overspeed. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent an overspeed of the aft fan disk from resulting in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the aircraft.

DATES: Effective August 26, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of August 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from GE Aircraft Engines, 1000 Western Ave., Lynn, MA 01910; telephone (617) 594–3140, fax (617) 594-4805. 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: Dave Keenan, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (617) 238–7139, fax (617) 238–7199.

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 General Electric Aircraft Engines (GE) CF700 series turbofan engines was published in the **Federal Register** on February 19, 1997 (62 FR 7387). That action proposed to require, within two years after the effective date of this AD, replacement of existing fan guards with new, improved fan guards in accordance with GE Service Bulletin (SB) No. (CF700) 72–154, dated December 20, 1996.

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

Eight commenters state that the AD should be withdrawn, since there has only been one fan guard related uncontained failure event in 30 years with 10 million operating hours fleet-wide. The FAA does not concur. Implicit in the comment is the assumption that since there has been only one such event to date, that necessarily means that there can be no other like events until the fleet has operated for another 30 years and 10 million hours. As a result of the uncontained failure and subsequent crash, the FAA has identified a new critical failure mode in the GE CF700 engine. This mode, exacerbated by the CF700 having a passive aft fan without overspeed protection, can result in an unsafe condition that needs addressing through an AD. The FAA has, therefore, determined that safety in air commerce requires that this new failure mode is addressed through the issuance of this AD.

Seven commenters state that the AD should be withdrawn due to the excessive financial burden of compliance. The FAA does not concur. The FAA is aware of the high cost of the improved containment guards; however, the basis for the AD is that an unsafe condition has been identified and needs to be addressed. During the certification of the affected engine's type design, the FAA determined that the design met applicable airworthiness requirements that established a cost beneficial level of safety. The FAA's current finding, that an unsafe condition exists requiring an AD, reflects only that in order to maintain the level of safety already established by the regulations at the time of type certification operators must perform certain required actions. Since these requirements do not add an additional regulatory burden, but merely return the affected engines to that level of safety, a full cost-benefit analysis is not required. The FAA has provided a cost analysis, and General Electric has reduced the cost of these fan guards for early orders to help offset this burden on operators.

Six commenters state that the AD should be withdrawn since the FAA and NTSB did not directly participate in the accident investigation. The FAA does not concur. Although the FAA and NTSB did not participate directly in the investigation, the FAA worked closely with representatives from GE's Flight Safety office, who were involved in the investigation with the French Authorities. This investigation involved hardware inspections, witness reports, and cockpit voice recorder information.

Two commenters state that the AD should be withdrawn since the increased weight of containment hardware would reduce the payload capacity and range of the aircraft. The FAA does not concur. The FAA has determined that the actions required in this AD are necessary to maintain the level of safety established by the certification basis at the time of type certification. This action is consistent with the FAA's statutory mandate to ensure safety in air commerce. While the FAA need not consider indirect costs, such as any reduction in the payload capacity or range of aircraft on