

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 FOCA has kept FAA informed of the situation described above.

The FAA's Determination and an Explanation of the Provisions of This Proposed AD

What has FAA decided? The FAA has examined the findings of the FOCA; reviewed all available information, including the service information referenced above; and determined that:

- The unsafe condition referenced in this document exists or could develop on other Pilatus PC-12 and PC-12/45 of the same type design that are on the U.S. registry;
- the actions specified in the previously-referenced service

information should be accomplished on the affected airplanes; and —AD action should be taken in order to correct this unsafe condition.

What would this proposed AD require? This proposed AD would require you to inspect the pedestal leg assembly on aft facing passenger seats for correct configuration. If incorrectly configured, this proposed AD would require you to modify to the correct configuration.

What are the differences between this proposed 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 proposed AD recommending that you verify that the corresponding Pilatus part number is correct.

Cost Impact

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

What would be the cost impact of this proposed AD on owners/operators of the affected airplanes? We estimate the following costs to accomplish the proposed 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 proposed 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 Proposed AD

What would be the compliance time of this proposed AD? The compliance time of this proposed AD is “within the next 90 days after the effective date of this AD.”

Why is the proposed compliance time presented in calendar time instead of hours time-in-service (TIS)? The compliance of this proposed 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 would 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

Would this proposed AD impact various entities? The regulations proposed herein would 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 responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, it is determined that this proposed rule would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

Would this proposed AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action? For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed action (1) is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a “significant rule” under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action has been placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting 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.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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. FAA amends § 39.13 by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

Pilatus Aircraft Ltd.: Docket No. 2003–CE–06–AD

(a) *What airplanes are affected by this AD?* This AD affects Models PC-12 and PC-12/45 airplanes, manufacturer serial numbers (MSN) 101 through 436 that: