

encountering windshear conditions will be delayed.

(b) 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, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Operations Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(c) 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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(d) This amendment becomes effective on May 15, 1995.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 21, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-10319 Filed 4-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-9207; AD 95-09-04]

Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC-8-100 and -300 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain de Havilland Model DHC-8-100 and -300 series airplanes, that requires an inspection to verify the integrity of the shield grounds for the cable harness of the electronic engine control (EEC), and correction of any discrepancy. This amendment also requires measurement of the electrical resistance of certain shield grounds, and repair, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by a report of an engine flameout after a lightning strike, due to several shields for the cable harness of the EEC not being properly grounded to the airframe. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent engine flameout due to insufficient protection of the EEC.

DATES: Effective May 30, 1995.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of May 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Bombardier Inc., Bombardier Regional Aircraft Division, Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3K 1Y5. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, Third Floor, Valley Stream, New York; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard Fiesel, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANE-174, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, Third Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581; telephone (516) 256-7504; fax (516) 568-2716.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain de Havilland Model DHC-8-100 and -300 series airplanes, was published in the **Federal Register** on September 21, 1994 (59 FR 48408). That action proposed to require a visual inspection to verify the integrity of the shield grounds for the cable harness of the EEC, and correction of any discrepancy. That action also proposed to require measurement of the electrical resistance of certain shield grounds, and repair, if necessary.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

One commenter requests that the proposed 45-day compliance time in paragraph (b) of the proposed AD be extended to permit operators to schedule the proposed actions according to the size of their individual fleets and, specifically, to allow up to 165 days for a fleet-wide inspection. The commenter bases this request on the following factors:

1. The commenter states that, to accomplish the proposed measurement requirement, the use of a low resistance ohm meter (micro-ohm) is necessary. The commenter has only one low resistance ohm meter to perform the measurement of all the airplanes in its fleet. With only one micro-ohm meter available, the commenter could inspect only a limited number of its fleet of airplanes during its regularly scheduled maintenance visits, and would not be

able to accomplish the proposed inspections within the proposed 45-day compliance time. Further, the commenter does not believe it should have to purchase or otherwise obtain additional units to satisfy the requirements of the proposed AD.

2. The commenter states that the actions specified in the service bulletin could not be accomplished in less than 25 hours and, that based on the amount of time available for a scheduled maintenance visit, up to 4 visits may be required to complete the inspection. The commenter is concerned about these additional expenses that would be associated with this action.

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request to extend the compliance time. In developing an appropriate compliance time for this action, the FAA considered not only the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition, but the normal maintenance schedules for timely accomplishment of the actions required by the final rule for all affected airplanes to continue to operate without compromising safety. In consideration of these items, the FAA has determined that the 45-day compliance time represents an average maintenance interval for the affected fleet, during which time the required inspections, measurement, repair, and restoration can reasonably be accomplished and an acceptable level of safety can be maintained. However, under the provisions of paragraph (e) of the final rule, the FAA may approve requests for adjustments to the compliance time if data are submitted to substantiate that such an adjustment would provide an acceptable level of safety.

As for the commenter's concern regarding the expenses associated with accomplishing the requirements of this AD, the FAA recognizes that the obligation to maintain aircraft in an airworthy condition is vital, but sometimes expensive. Because AD's require specific actions (such as testing with special equipment) to address specific unsafe conditions as required in this rule, they appear to impose costs that would not otherwise be borne by operators. Attributing those costs solely to the issuance of this AD is unrealistic because, in the interest of maintaining safe aircraft, prudent operators would accomplish the required actions in a timely manner even if they were not required to do so by the AD.

One commenter requests that a certain procedure for repairing frayed or broken harnesses be referenced in the proposed rule as an acceptable means of repair. The commenter states that