

(FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003-CE-06-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, 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: Doug Rudolph, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4059; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

What events have caused this AD? The Federal Office for Civil Aviation (FOCA), which is the airworthiness authority for Switzerland, recently notified FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Pilatus Models PC-12 and PC-12/45 airplanes. The FOCA reports that, during manufacture of certain aft facing aircraft passenger seats (vendor part numbers (VPN) 403008-1 and 403008-2), the forward pedestal legs were installed in reverse order. One instance was found during the seat manufacturer's final quality control inspection. Pilatus found another instance.

What is the potential impact if FAA took no action? This condition, if not corrected, could result in failure of the aircraft seat pedestal leg assembly. Such failure could result in passenger injury in an emergency situation.

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

Pilatus Models PC-12 and PC-12/45 airplanes. This proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on February 19, 2003 (68 FR 7947). The NPRM proposed to require you to inspect the pedestal leg assembly on aft facing passenger seats for correct configuration. If incorrectly configured, the NPRM proposed to require you to modify to the correct configuration.

Was the public invited to comment? The FAA encouraged interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. We did not receive any comments on the proposed rule or on our determination of the cost to the public.

FAA's Determination

What is FAA's final determination on this issue? After careful review of all available information related to the subject presented above, we have determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed except for minor editorial corrections. We have determined that these minor corrections:

- Provide the intent that was proposed in the NPRM for correcting the unsafe condition; and
- Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM.

What are the differences between this AD, the service information, and the FOCA AD? The FOCA AD and the service information require an inspection of the identification tag on certain passenger seats to determine if the Pilatus part number correctly

corresponds to the ERDA vendor part number. The identification tag may incorrectly identify the Pilatus part number; although the ERDA vendor part number is correct. If the corresponding part numbers are incorrect, the FOCA AD and the service information require affixing a new identification tag with the correct corresponding Pilatus part number. The procedures for accomplishing this inspection and modification are contained in Decrane Aircraft, ERDA, Inc., Service Bulletin SB02011, Revision A, June 3, 2002.

Because the ERDA part number is correct, we are not including this as part of the unsafe condition. However, we will include a note in this AD recommending that you verify that the corresponding Pilatus part number is correct.

How does the revision to 14 CFR part 39 affect this AD? On July 10, 2002, FAA published a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs FAA's AD system. This regulation now includes material that relates to special flight permits, alternative methods of compliance, and altered products. This material previously was included in each individual AD. Since this material is included in 14 CFR part 39, we will not include it in future AD actions.

How many airplanes does this AD impact? We estimate that this AD affects 280 airplanes in the U.S. registry.

What is the cost impact of this AD on owners/operators of the affected airplanes? We estimate the following costs to accomplish the inspection:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane	Total cost on U.S. operators
1 workhour × \$60 = \$60	No parts required to perform inspection	\$60	\$60 × 280 = \$16,800

We estimate the following costs to accomplish the modification:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane	Total cost on U.S. operators
2 workhours × \$60 = \$120	\$150	\$270	\$270 × 280 = \$75,600

Compliance Time of This AD

What is the compliance time of this AD? The compliance time of this AD is "within the next 90 days after the effective date of this AD."

Why is the compliance time presented in calendar time instead of hours time-in-service (TIS)? The compliance of this AD is presented in calendar time instead of hours TIS because the unsafe

condition is a result of an improper installation. The unsafe condition has the same chance of occurring on an airplane with 50 hours TIS as it is for an airplane with 1,000 hours TIS. Therefore, we believe that a compliance time of 90 days will:

- Ensure that the unsafe condition does not go undetected for a long period of time on the affected airplanes; and

- Not inadvertently ground any of the affected airplanes.

Regulatory Impact

Does this AD impact various entities? The regulations adopted herein will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and