2. Additional performance measures applicable to tests and rational analysis conducted to show compliance with §§ 25.562 and 25.785 for side-facing seats:

(a) Body-to-body contact: Contact between the head, pelvis, torso, or shoulder area of one ATD with the adjacent-seated ATD's head, pelvis, torso, or shoulder area is not allowed. Contact during rebound is allowed.

(b) Thoracic: The deflection of any of the ES–2re ATD upper, middle, and lower ribs must not exceed 1.73 inches (44 mm). Data must be processed as defined in Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) 571.214.

(c) Abdominal: The sum of the measured ES–2re ATD front, middle, and rear abdominal forces must not exceed 562 lb (2,500 N). Data must be processed as defined in FMVSS 571.214.

(d) Pelvic: The pubic symphysis force measured by the ES–2re ATD must not exceed 1,350 lb (6,000 N). Data must be processed as defined in FMVSS 571.214.

(e) Leg: Axial rotation of the upper-leg (femur) must be limited to 35 degrees in either direction from the nominal seated position.

(f) Neck: As measured by the ES–2re ATD and filtered at channel frequency class (CFC) 600 as defined in SAE J211:

(1) The upper-neck tension force at the occipital condyle location must be less than 405 lb (1,800 N).

(2) The upper-neck compression force at the occipital condyle location must be less than 405 lb (1,800 N).

(3) The upper-neck bending torque about the ATD *x*-axis at the occipital condyle location must be less than 1,018 in-lb (115 Nm).

(4) The upper-neck resultant shear force at the occipital condyle location must be less than 186 lb (825 N).

(g) Occupant (ES–2re ATD) retention: The pelvic restraint must remain on the ES–2re ATD's pelvis during the impact and rebound phases of the test. The upper-torso restraint straps (if present) must remain on the ATD's shoulder during the impact.

(h) Ŏccupant (ES–2re ATD) support:

(1) Pelvis excursion: The load-bearing portion of the bottom of the ATD pelvis must not translate beyond the edges of its seat's bottom seat-cushion supporting structure.

(2) Upper-torso support: The lateral flexion of the ATD torso must not exceed 40 degrees from the normal upright position during the impact.

3. For seats with airbag systems in the shoulder belts, show that the airbag systems in the shoulder belts will deploy and provide protection under crash conditions where it is necessary to prevent serious injury. The means of protection must take into consideration a range of stature from a 2-year-old child to a 95th percentile male. The airbag systems in the shoulder belts must provide a consistent approach to energy absorption throughout that range of occupants. When the seat systems include airbag systems, the systems must be included in each of the certification tests as they would be installed in the airplane. In addition, the following situations must be considered:

(a) The seat occupant is holding an infant.

(b) The seat occupant is a pregnant woman.

4. The airbag systems in the shoulder belts must provide adequate protection for each occupant regardless of the number of occupants of the seat assembly, considering that unoccupied seats may have active airbag systems in the shoulder belts.

5. The design must prevent the airbag systems in the shoulder belts from being either incorrectly buckled or incorrectly installed, such that the airbag systems in the shoulder belts would not properly deploy. Alternatively, it must be shown that such deployment is not hazardous to the occupant and will provide the required injury protection.

6. It must be shown that the airbag systems in the shoulder belts are not susceptible to inadvertent deployment as a result of wear and tear, inertial loads resulting from in-flight or ground maneuvers (e.g., including gusts and hard landings), and other operating and environmental conditions (e.g., vibrations and moisture) likely to occur in service.

7. Deployment of the airbag systems in the shoulder belts must not introduce injury mechanisms to the seated occupants or result in injuries that could impede rapid egress. This assessment should include an occupant whose belt is loosely fastened.

8. It must be shown that inadvertent deployment of the airbag systems in the shoulder belts, during the most critical part of the flight, will either meet the requirement of § 25.1309(b) or not cause a hazard to the airplane or its occupants.

9. It must be shown that the airbag systems in the shoulder belts will not impede rapid egress of occupants 10 seconds after airbag deployment.

10. The airbag systems must be protected from lightning and highintensity radiated fields (HIRF). The threats to the airplane specified in existing regulations regarding lighting, § 25.1316, and HIRF, § 25.1317, are incorporated by reference for the purpose of measuring lightning and HIRF protection.

11. The airbag systems in the shoulder belts must function properly after loss of normal aircraft electrical power and after a transverse separation of the fuselage at the most critical location. A separation at the location of the airbag systems in the shoulder belts does not have to be considered.

12. It must be shown that the airbag systems in the shoulder belts will not release hazardous quantities of gas or particulate matter into the cabin.

13. The airbag systems in the shoulder-belt installations must be protected from the effects of fire such that no hazard to occupants will result.

14. A means must be available for a crew member to verify the integrity of the airbag systems in the shoulder-belts activation system prior to each flight or it must be demonstrated to reliably operate between inspection intervals. The FAA considers that the loss of the airbag-system deployment function alone (i.e., independent of the conditional event that requires the airbag-system deployment) is a majorfailure condition.

15. The inflatable material may not have an average burn rate of greater than 2.5 inches/minute when tested using the horizontal flammability test defined in part 25, appendix F, part I, paragraph (b)(5).

16. Once deployed, the airbag systems in the shoulder belts must not adversely affect the emergency-lighting system (e.g., block floor proximity lights to the extent that the lights no longer meet their intended function).

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 9, 2013.

# Jeffrey E. Duven,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service. [FR Doc. 2013–19754 Filed 8–14–13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**Federal Aviation Administration** 

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2013-0262; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-17548; AD 2013-16-10]

#### RIN 2120-AA64

# Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard Division and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT. **ACTION:** Final rule. SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Hamilton Standard Division model 6/ 5500/F and 24PF and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation model 14RF, 14SF, 247F, and 568F series propellers. This AD was prompted by the amount of corrosion detected during major inspections (MI). This AD requires incorporating inspections, based on a calendar time, into the propeller maintenance schedule. We are issuing this AD to prevent corrosion that could result in propeller failure and loss of airplane control.

**DATES:** This AD is effective September 19, 2013.

ADDRESSES: The Docket Operations office is located at Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

For service information identified in this AD, contact Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation, One Hamilton Road, Mail Stop 1A–3–C63, Windsor Locks, CT 06096–1010; or Hamilton Standard Division, One Hamilton Road, United Technologies Corporation, Mail Stop 1A–3–C63, Windsor Locks, CT 06096– 1010; phone: 877–808–7575; fax: 860– 660–0372; email:

tech.solutions@hs.utc.com; Internet: http://myhs.hamiltonsundstrand.com. You may view this service information at the FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

#### Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http:// www.regulations.gov;* or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (phone: 800–647– 5527) is provided in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Schwetz, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; phone: 781– 238–7761; fax: 781–238–7170; email: michael.schwetz@faa.gov.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Discussion

We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 to include an AD that would apply to the specified products. The NPRM published in the **Federal Register** on May 23, 2013 (78 FR 30795). The NPRM proposed to require incorporating inspections, based on a calendar time, into the propeller maintenance schedule.

# Comments

We gave the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. We received no comments on the NPRM (78 FR 30795, May 23, 2013) or on the determination of the cost to the public.

#### Conclusion

We reviewed the relevant data and determined that air safety and the public interest require adopting this AD as proposed except for minor editorial changes. We have determined that these minor changes:

• Are consistent with the intent that was proposed in the NPRM (78 FR 30795, May 23, 2013) for correcting the unsafe condition; and

• Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM (78 FR 30795, May 23, 2013).

# **Costs of Compliance**

We estimate that this AD affects about 1,044 propeller/hub combinations installed on airplanes of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it will take about 160 hours per propeller to perform one MI. The average labor rate is \$85 per hour. Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of this AD on U.S. operators to be \$14,198,400.

# Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: "General requirements." Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

#### **Regulatory Findings**

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD 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 responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

- (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),

(3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska to the extent that it justifies making a regulatory distinction, and

(4) 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.

### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

# Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):

2013–16–10 Hamilton Standard Division and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation: Amendment 39–17548; Docket No. FAA–2013–0262; Directorate Identifier 2013–NE–13–AD.

# (a) Effective Date

This AD is effective September 19, 2013.

# (b) Affected ADs

None.

# (c) Applicability

This AD applies to Hamilton Standard Division 6/5500/F and 24PF and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation 14RF, 14SF, 247F, and 568F series propellers.

#### (d) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by the amount of corrosion detected during major inspections

(MI). We are issuing this AD to prevent corrosion that could result in propeller failure and loss of airplane control.

# (e) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

## (f) MI for Blades and Hubs That Have an Updated Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS)

For Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation propeller models 14RF-9, 14RF-21, 14SF-5. 14SF–7, 14SF–11E, and 568F–1, that have an approved update to the ALS, within 45 days after the effective date of this AD, perform an MI on the blades and hubs no later than seven years after the date since installation (DSI). The DSI will begin at initial installation after the most recent MI or initial installation after production. Guidance on the inspections can be found in the applicable Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation models/manuals 14RF-9/P5186, revision 12, January 20, 2012; 14RF-21/P5189, revision 8, February 20, 2013; 14SF–5/P5188, revision 10, dated January 14, 2013; 14SF-7/P5185. revision 13, dated December 13, 2011; 14SF-11E/P5207, revision 2, dated June 28, 2012; and 568F-1/P5206, revision 9, dated February 22, 2013.

#### (g) MI for Blades and Hubs That Do Not Have an Updated ALS

For Hamilton Standard Division propeller models 6/5500/F and 24PF and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation propeller models 14RF-19, 14RF-37, 14SF-11, 14SF-15, 14SF-23, 14SF-17, 14SF-19, 247F-1, 247F-1E, 247F-3, 568F-1, 568F-5, and 568F-7, that do not have an approved update to the ALS, within one year after the effective date of this AD, perform an MI on the blades and hubs no later than seven years after the DSI. The DSI will begin at initial installation after the most recent MI or initial installation after production. Guidance on the inspections can be found in the applicable Hamilton Standard Division models/manuals 6/5500/ F/P5190 and 24PF/61-12-01, and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation models/manuals 14RF-19/P5199, 14RF-37/P5209, 14SF-11/ P5196, 14SF-15/P5197, 14SF-23/P5197, 14SF-17/P5198, 14SF-19/P5198, 247F-1/ P4202, 247F-1E/P5204, 247F-3/P5205, 568F-1/P5214, 568F-5/P5203, and 568F-7/ P5211.

# (h) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

The Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, may approve AMOCs for this AD. Use the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19 to make your request.

# (i) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Michael Schwetz, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; phone: 781–238– 7761; fax: 781–238–7170; email: michael.schwetz@faa.gov.

(2) Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation models/manuals 14RF–9/P5186, revision 12, January 20, 2012; 14RF–21/P5189, revision 8, February 20, 2013; 14SF-5/P5188, revision 10, dated January 14, 2013; 14SF-7/P5185, revision 13, dated December 13, 2011; 14SF-11E/P5207, revision 2, dated June 28, 2012; and 568F-1/P5206, revision 9, dated February 22, 2013, which are not incorporated by reference in this AD, can be obtained from Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation, using the contact information in paragraph (i)(3) of this AD.

(3) For service information identified in the AD, contact Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation, One Hamilton Road, Mail Stop 1A–3–C63, Windsor Locks, CT 06096–1010; or Hamilton Standard Division, United Technologies Corporation, One Hamilton Road, Mail Stop 1A–3–C63, Windsor Locks, CT 06096–1010; phone: 877–808–7575; fax: 860–660–0372; email:

tech.solutions@hs.utc.com; Internet: http:// myhs.hamiltonsundstrand.com. You may view this service information at the FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

# (j) Material Incorporated by Reference

None.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on August 2, 2013.

# Carlos A. Pestana,

Acting Assistant Directorate Manager, Engine & Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–19649 Filed 8–9–13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# **Federal Aviation Administration**

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2013-0472; Directorate Identifier 98-CE-097-AD; Amendment 39-17538; AD 99-07-10 R1]

#### RIN 2120-AA64

# Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule; rescission.

**SUMMARY:** We are rescinding an airworthiness directive (AD) for PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Model P–180 airplanes. The rescinded AD resulted from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as partial detachment of the inner protective film of the composite nacelles. Since issuance of the rescinded AD, we have determined that

the unsafe condition does not exist or is not likely to develop on affected type design airplanes.

**DATES:** This AD is effective September 19, 2013.

ADDRESSES: You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http:// www.regulations.gov;* or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5527) is in the ADDRESSES section.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mike Kiesov, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4144; fax: (816) 329–4090; email: *mike.kiesov@faa.gov*.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

# Discussion

We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by rescinding AD 99–07–10 (64 FR 14824, March 29, 1999) that applied to the specified products. The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on May 30, 2013 (78 FR 32363).

On March 18, 1999, we issued AD 99– 07–10, Amendment 39–11095 (64 FR 14824, March 29, 1999), with an effective date of May 10, 1999. The AD required actions intended to address an unsafe condition on the products listed above.

Since we issued AD 99-07-10, Amendment 39-11095 (64 FR 14824, March 29, 1999), the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Community, has issued AD Cancellation Notice No.: 2013-0085-CN, dated April 8, 2013, which cancelled Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile (ENAC) (the airworthiness authority for Italy) AD No. 98-208, dated June 9, 1998. Italian AD No. 98–208 required the inspections and corrective actions of Piaggio Service Bulletin (Mandatory) No.: SB-80-0101, Original Issue: May 6, 1998. AD 99-07-10, Amendment 39-11095 (64 FR 14824, March 29, 1999), is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by ENAC.

We have been notified that since 2000, all nacelles for PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A Model P–180 airplanes have been manufactured by a different supplier, and no new occurrences of film detachment have been reported on earlier manufactured airplanes. Therefore, nacelle inner panel