

summarizes each contact we have with the public that concerns the substantive parts of this proposed AD.

How Can I Be Sure FAA Receives My Comment?

If you want FAA to acknowledge the receipt of your mailed comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. On the postcard, write "Comments to Docket No. 2000-CE-64-AD." We will date stamp and mail the postcard back to you.

Discussion

What Events Have Caused Us To Issue the Earlier NPRM?

We received reports that an unsafe condition exists on certain R.E. Rust Models DeHavilland DH.C1 Chipmunk 21, 22, and 22A airplanes. After reviewing several of these airplanes, stress corrosion cracking was found on the tailplane attachment brackets and fatigue cracks and chaffing were found on the engine mount frame.

Cracks in the engine mount frame were found in the area of the junction of the front and rear top tube and engine mounting foot support brackets and in the front of the frame. We have determined that fatigue is the cause of the cracks. The upper aft mount frame tubes were also found to have damage caused by chaffing by the cowl support rod.

What Are the Consequences if the Condition Is Not Corrected?

These conditions, if not corrected, could result in failure of the tailplane attachment brackets and failure of the engine mount. Such failures could lead to loss of control of the airplane.

Has FAA Taken Any Action to This Point?

We issued a proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to certain R.E. Rust Models DeHavilland DH.C1 Chipmunk 21, 22, and 22A airplanes. This proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on November 12, 2002 (67 FR 68536). The NPRM proposed to require you to repetitively inspect the tailplane attachment brackets and replace each bracket. The NPRM also proposed to require you to repetitively inspect each joint of the port and starboard engine mount frame and the rear upper mount frame tubes for cracks and/or damage and repair any cracks and/or damage found.

Was the Public Invited To Comment?

The FAA encouraged interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. The following presents the comments received on the proposal and FAA's response to each comment:

Comment Issue No. 1: Change the Compliance Time for Replacing the Tailplane Attachment Brackets

What Is the Commenter's Concern?

The commenter states that replacement parts for the tailplane attachment brackets may not be available from the manufacturer within 90 days after the effective date of this AD. Therefore, the commenter suggests allowing more time to acquire parts by changing the compliance time for replacing the tailplane attachment brackets if cracks are found during the initial inspection from 90 days to 12 months after the effective date of this AD.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

The commenter does not offer any solution to ensure the airworthiness of the airplanes until the parts become available. We cannot increase the compliance time unless other means to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes are substantiated.

We will consider an alternative method of compliance if the alternative provides an equivalent level of safety as outlined in paragraph (e) of this AD.

We are not changing the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Comment Issue No. 2: Change the Compliance Time for the Repetitive Inspections of the Tailplane Attachment Brackets

What Is the Commenter's Concern?

The commenter suggests that the repetitive inspections of the tailplane attachment brackets should be changed to every 150 fatigue hour or 6 months, whichever comes first, in order to ensure the airworthiness of these airplanes. The NPRM only proposed inspections every 6 months.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

We concur with the commenter. Requiring repetitive inspections at every 150 fatigue hours or 6 months, whichever comes first, will ensure that the unsafe condition will not go undetected on high usage airplanes for a long period of time and will ensure the airworthiness of the affected airplanes.

We will make this change. Fatigue hours are hours TIS multiplied by the role factor (operational use) as specified in British Aerospace Mandatory

Technical News Sheet Series: Chipmunk (C1), No. 138, Issue: 5, dated August 1, 1985. Because adding the fatigue hours requirement to the repetitive inspection compliance time could increase the burden upon the public, we will reopen the comment period and issue a supplemental NPRM.

Comment Issue No. 3: Remove the Grace Period Allowed Beyond the Safe Life Limit for Replacing the Tailplane Attachment Brackets

What Is the Commenter's Concern?

The commenter states that the ultimate safe life limit of 9,984 fatigue hours for part number C1.TP.167 is a never exceed life and cannot be extended. Once an airplane has reached this safe life limit, the tailplane attachment bracket must be replaced before further flight.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

We concur that a life limit is a never exceed limit. However, the safe life limit for the tailplane attachment bracket has not previously been established and enforced for the owners/operators of the affected airplanes. The life limit was not part of the type certificate data and was not previously mandated by an AD. Part of this proposed AD is establishing the safe life limit for this part. Removing the 90 day grace period for these airplanes already over or nearing 9,984 fatigue hours on the tailplane attachment bracket could inadvertently ground these airplanes when the AD becomes effective.

We are not changing the final rule AD action based on this comment.

The Supplemental NPRM

What Events Have Caused FAA To Issue a Supplemental NPRM?

In addition to adding the fatigue hour requirement to the repetitive inspection compliance time, we are correcting reference to the life limit as 9,984 fatigue hours instead of 9,984 hours TIS. Fatigue hours are hours TIS multiplied by the role factor (operational use).

How Will the Changes to the NPRM Impact the Public?

Proposing to change the intervals for performing the repetitive inspections of the tailplane attachment brackets to include an hour limitation and changing hours TIS to fatigue hours go beyond the scope of what was already proposed. Therefore, we are issuing a supplemental NPRM and reopening the comment period to allow the public additional time to comment on the proposed AD.