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 and subsequent engine failure, accomplish the following:

(a) At the next engine overhaul, or whenever the crankshaft is next removed from the engine, after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, determine if the crankshaft was manufactured using the airmelt or vacuum arc remelt (VAR) process in accordance with the identification procedure described in TCM Critical SB No. CSB96–8, dated June 25, 1996. If the crankshaft was manufactured using the airmelt process or if the manufacturing process is unknown, remove the crankshaft from service and replace with a serviceable crankshaft manufactured using the VAR process.

(b) For all TCM IO–360, LTSIO–360, TSIO–360, IO–520, IO–520, LTSIO–520 and TSIO–520 and Rolls-Royce, plc IO–360 and TSIO–360 engine models that have VAR crankshafts installed, regardless of serial number; at the next and every subsequent crankshaft removal from the engine case or installation of a replacement crankshaft, prior to crankshaft installation in the engine, conduct an ultrasonic inspection of the crankshaft in accordance with the procedures specified in TCM Mandatory SB No. MSB96–10, dated August 15, 1996, and, if necessary, replace with a serviceable part.

Note 2: Accomplishment of the ultrasonic inspection required by this AD does not fulfill any requirements for magnetic particle inspection or any other inspections specified in TCM or Rolls-Royce, plc overhaul manuals.

(c) The ultrasonic inspection of the crankshaft must be performed by a non-destructive test (NDT) ultrasonic (UT) Level II inspector who is qualified under the guidelines established by the American Society of Nondestructive Testing or MIL–STD–410 or FAA-approved equivalent, or must be trained by TCM personnel or their designated representative on how to accomplish and conduct this inspection procedure. The person approving the engine for return to service is required to verify that the UT inspection was accomplished in accordance with the requirements of this paragraph.

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

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Atlanta 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.

(f) The actions required by this AD shall be done in accordance with the following TCM service documents:

Document No.	Pages	Date
CSB96–8 ..... Total pages: 6.	1–6	June 25, 1996.
MSB96–10 ..... Total pages: 3.	1–3	August 15, 1996.

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 Teledyne Continental Motors, P.O. Box 90, Mobile, AL 36601; telephone (334) 438–3411. 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 January 23, 1998.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on December 12, 1997.

Jay J. Pardee,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–33142 Filed 12–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–SW–50–AD; Amendment 39–10261; AD 97–26–18]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–360C Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Eurocopter France Model SA–360C helicopters. This action requires replacement of the main gear box (MGB) input bevel pinion (bevel pinion). This amendment is prompted by service reports of bevel pinion fatigue cracking. This condition, if not corrected, could result in failure of the MGB and a subsequent forced landing.

DATES: Effective January 5, 1998.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before January 20, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Office of Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97-SW–50-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, (817) 222–5961.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Direction Generale De L'Aviation (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on Eurocopter France Model SA–360C helicopters with MGB, part number (P/N) 360A32–2000—all dash numbers, installed. The DGAC advises that replacement of the MGB bevel pinion, P/N 360A32–1021–20, is necessary at 1,000 hours time-in-service (TIS) intervals to prevent fatigue cracking of the bevel pinion, failure of the MGB, and a subsequent forced landing.

Eurocopter France has issued Service Bulletin No. 01.35, dated January 14, 1997, which specifies replacement of the MGB bevel pinion at 1,000 hour TIS intervals. The DGAC classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued DGAC AD 97–027–041(B), dated February 12, 1997, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these helicopters in France.

This helicopter model is manufactured in France 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, 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 this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other Eurocopter France Model SA–360C helicopters of the same type design registered in the United States, this AD is being issued to prevent bevel pinion fatigue cracking, failure of the MGB, and a subsequent forced landing. This AD requires replacement of the bevel pinion at specified TIS intervals.

None of the Eurocopter France Model SA–360C helicopters affected by this AD action are on the U.S. Register. All

helicopters included in the applicability of this rule are currently operated by non-U.S. operators under foreign registry; therefore, they are not directly affected by this AD action. However, the FAA considers that this rule is necessary to ensure that the unsafe condition is addressed in the event that any of these subject helicopters are imported and placed on the U.S. Register in the future.

Should an affected helicopter be imported and placed on the U.S. Register, it will require approximately 8.5 work hours to accomplish the required actions, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts will cost $17,000 per helicopter for each replacement. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this AD will be $17,510 per helicopter for each MGB bevel pinion replacement.

Since this AD action does not affect any helicopter that is currently on the U.S. register, it has no adverse economic impact and imposes no additional burden on any person. Therefore, notice and public procedures hereon are unnecessary and the amendment may be made effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

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 rule must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 97-SW–50-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 notice and prior public comment are unnecessary in promulgating this regulation and therefore, it can be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft since none of these model helicopters are registered in the United States, and that it 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, 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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

97–26–18 Eurocopter France: Amendment 39–10261. Docket No. 97–SW–50–AD.

Applicability: Model SA–360C helicopters with main gearbox (MGB), part number (P/N) 360A32–2000—all dash numbers, installed, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each helicopter 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 helicopters that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (c) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition, or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any helicopter from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent fatigue cracking of the MGB bevel pinion, failure of the MGB, and a subsequent forced landing, accomplish the following:

(a) Before further flight, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,000 hours time-in-service (TIS), replace the MGB bevel pinion, P/N 360A32–1021–20, on MGBs that have accumulated 900 or more hours TIS since first installed on any helicopter or since the last MGB overhaul.

(b) On or before the accumulation of 1,000 hours TIS, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,000 hours TIS, replace the bevel pinion, P/N 360A32–1021–20, on MGBs that have accumulated less than 900 hours TIS since first installed on any helicopter or since the last MGB overhaul. This AD revises the Airworthiness Limitations section of the maintenance manual by establishing a new retirement life for the bevel pinion, P/N 360A32–1021–20, of 1,000 hours TIS.

Note 2: Eurocopter France Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 01.35, dated January 14, 1997, contains additional information concerning the subject of this AD.

(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, Rotorcraft Standards Staff, FAA, Rotorcraft Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may concur or comment and then send it to the Manager, Rotorcraft Standards Staff.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Rotorcraft Standards Staff.

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

(e) This amendment becomes effective on January 5, 1998.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in Direction Generale de L'Aviation Civile (France) AD 97–027–041(B), dated February 12, 1997.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on December 12, 1997.

Eric Bries,

Acting Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–33145 Filed 12–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 90–CE–28–AD; Amendment 39–10259 AD 97–26–16]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 402C and 414A Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes Airworthiness Directive (AD) 85–13–03 R2, which currently requires repetitively inspecting the engine mount beams for cracks on certain Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) Models 402C and 414A airplanes, and replacing any cracked beams. This AD requires incorporating engine mount kits that will eliminate the need for the repetitive inspection requirement of AD 85–13–03 R2. This AD results from the Federal Aviation Administration's policy on aging commuter-class aircraft, which is to eliminate or, in certain instances, reduce the number of certain repetitive short-interval inspections when improved parts or modifications are available. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of the engine mount beam caused by fatigue cracks, which could result in loss of the engine with consequent loss of the airplane.

DATES: Effective February 2, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of February 2, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from the Cessna Aircraft Company, Product Support, P.O. Box 7706, Wichita, Kansas 67277, telephone (316) 941–7550; facsimile (316) 942–9006. This information may also be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 90–CE–28–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David L. Ostrodka, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946–4129; facsimile (316) 946–4407.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Events Leading to the Issuance of This AD

AD 85–13–03 R2, Amendment 39–5147, currently requires repetitively inspecting the engine mount beams for cracks on certain Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) Models 402C and 414A airplanes, and replacing any cracked beams. On August 9, 1990 (55 FR 32442), a proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would supersede AD 85–13–03 R2 was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM). This NPRM proposed to supersede AD 85–13–03 R2 with a new AD that would have retained the repetitive inspections initially, and would have required eventual modification of the engine mount beams upon the accumulation of a certain amount of usage time on the airplane, as terminating action for the repetitive inspections.

Interested persons were afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. One comment was received regarding the NPRM and no comments were received regarding the FAA's determination of the cost to the public.

Cessna recommended a change to the original NPRM to account for airplanes that may have Cessna Kit SK414–19 incorporated without Cessna Kit SK414–17 ever being incorporated. Cessna stated that, as written, the NPRM would not require the 9,600 hour time-in-service (TIS) repetitive radiographic inspections for these airplanes.

The FAA concurred and determined that any AD action on this issue should require mandatory incorporation of the two appropriate Cessna SK414–19–* kits (five different kits) and then repetitive radiographic inspections at 9,600-hour TIS intervals on all airplanes. This would assure that all airplanes are covered by the repetitive radiographic inspections.

The FAA re-examined this issue and determined that the actions proposed in the original NPRM were still valid safety issues, but that the engine mount beams should be modified at a certain time period for all airplanes instead of relying on repetitive inspections to detect cracks until each airplane accumulates a certain amount of hours TIS.

Since the comment period for the original NPRM had closed and revision of the NPRM to require engine beam modification at a certain period of time for all of the affected Cessna Model 402C and 414A airplanes proposed actions that went beyond the scope of what was already proposed, the FAA issued a supplemental NPRM (62 FR 39490, July 23, 1997) to allow additional time for the public to comment.

Interested persons were again afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received on the supplemental NPRM.

Comment No. 1: Change of Compliance Time

One commenter states that the compliance time of ''within the next 100 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD'' is unrealistic for airplane owners/operators that have the Cessna Kit SK414–17 incorporated on their airplanes. The commenter states that a more realistic time would be to coincide with the next 1,600-hour engine overhaul.

The FAA concurs that this would be a more realistic compliance time for these owners/operators with these kits incorporated on their airplanes. In addition, the FAA has determined a more realistic compliance time for those owners/operators not having the Cessna Kit SK414–17 incorporated on their airplanes would be at 200 hours TIS to coincide with the inspections currently required by AD 85–13–03 R2. The final rule has been changed accordingly.

Comment No. 2: The Cost Estimate is Too Low

Two commenters state that the FAA's estimate of the cost impact on the public is too low by a factor of two or more. One of these commenters presented an example of the cost impact for a specific design configuration, which includes adding multiple kits to both engines. This example also includes 30 hours of labor for engine removal. The commenters request that the FAA re-examine the cost estimate and then