(c) For propellers with 500 or more total hours TIS, or unknown TIS on the effective date of this AD, inspect, and rework or replace, as necessary, within the next 50 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, in accordance with Sensenich Propeller SB No. R–14A, dated November 15, 1994.

(d) For propellers with less than 500 total hours TIS on the effective date of this AD, inspect, and rework or replace, as necessary, prior to accumulating 550 total hours TIS, in accordance with Sensenich Propeller SB No. R–14A, dated November 15, 1994.

(e) Mark with a suffix letter ''K'' propellers that have been inspected, reworked, or replaced in accordance with Sensenich Propeller SB No. R–14A, dated November 15, 1994, and found satisfactory. New production propellers include change ''K'' or subsequent changes.

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

Note: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the New York Aircraft Certification Office.

(g) 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 November 28, 1995.

Jay J. Pardee,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–29843 Filed 12–6–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 90–CE–59–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. (Formerly Piper Aircraft Corporation) Models PA31, PA31–325, PA31–350, PA31P, PA31T1, and PA31T Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to supersede Airworthiness Directive (AD) 80–26–05, which currently requires the following on The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. (Piper) Models PA31, PA31–325, PA31–350, PA31P, PA31T1, and PA31T airplanes: repetitively inspecting the main landing gear (MLG) inboard door hinges and attachment angles for cracks, and replacing any cracked MLG inboard door hinge or attachment angle. The Federal Aviation Administration's policy on aging commuter-class aircraft is to eliminate or, in certain instances, reduce the number of certain repetitive short-interval inspections when improved parts or modifications are available. The proposed action would retain the current repetitive inspections contained in AD 80–26–05, and would require incorporating a MLG inboard door hinge and attachment angle assembly of improved design (part number 47529–32) or approved hinges and angles made of steel as terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement. The actions specified in the proposed AD are intended to prevent separation of the inboard MLG door from the airplane caused by a cracked inboard door hinge or attachment angle, which, if not detected and corrected, could result in the MLG jamming and loss of control of the airplane during landing operations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 21, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 90–CE–59–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 relates to the proposed AD may be obtained from The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Customer Services, 2926 Piper Drive, Vero Beach, Florida 32960. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina Marsh, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, suite 2–160, College Park, Georgia 30337–2748; telephone (404) 305–7362; facsimile (404) 305–7348.

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. 90–CE–59–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. 90–CE–59–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

The FAA has determined that reliance on critical repetitive inspections on aging commuter-class airplanes carries an unnecessary safety risk when a design change exists that could eliminate or, in certain instances, reduce the number of those critical inspections. In determining what inspections are critical, the FAA considers (1) the safety consequences if the known problem is not detected during the inspection; (2) the probability of the problem not being detected during the inspection; (3) whether the inspection area is difficult to access; and (4) the possibility of damage to an adjacent structure as a result of the problem.

These factors have led the FAA to establish an aging commuter-class aircraft policy that requires incorporating a known design change when it could replace a critical repetitive inspection. With this policy in mind, the FAA conducted a review of existing AD's that apply to Piper Models PA31–350 and PA31T3 airplanes. Assisting the FAA in this review were (1) The New Piper Aircraft, Inc.; (2) the Regional Airlines Association (RAA); and (3) several operators of the affected airplanes.