

299817

FAA-04-18744-5

Aircraft Certification Service AD PROPOSAL WORKSHEET

DOCKET NUMBER: FAA-2004-18744
TECH WRITER: DL, 2004-CE-24-AD

PROPOSED ACTION:

- Telegraphic AD
- Priority Letter
- Immediately Adopted AD
- Federal Register version of Telegraphic AD or Priority Letter
- Final Rule after NPRM (*See Note on next page)
- Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
- Other _____

Is this proposed action one of the following? (Check if applicable):

- Supersedure of an AD
- Revision of an AD
- Supplemental NPRM

NO. 100-110-100
2004 OCT 13 10 31 AM
COMMUNICATION

1. Product Manufacturer.

**GREAT LAKES AIRCRAFT COMPANY, LLC, P. O. BOX 9, PALMER LAKE,
COLORADO 80133 Tel: (719) 481-4115 Fax: (719) 481-0105 E-mail: johnaduncan@msn.com
Web site: None**

2. Applies to (models, serial numbers or references, installations, part numbers, as applicable).

All Model 2T-1A-1 and 2T-1A-2 airplanes having Lycoming IO-360-B1F6 or AIO-360-B1G6 engines installed.

3. ACO project engineer.

Name/Title/Branch: **Roger A. Caldwell - Denver ACO - ANM-100D**
26805 East 68th Avenue, Room 214
Denver, Colorado 80249-6361

Telephone **(303) 342-1086**
Fax: **(303) 342-1088**

4. Directorate Project Officer (if applicable) and title.

Name/Title/Branch: **Steve Thompson, Small Airplane Directorate -ACE - 112**
Telephone **(816) 329-4140**
Fax: **(816) 329-4090**

5. If this action is a Final Rule after NPRM, list the docket number and the number of public comments received. **Fill out the "AD Proposal Worksheet Attachment: Disposition of Comments."**

Docket No.:

Number of comments received: None

**NOTE: For Final Rules after NPRM, if any of the following requested information (in Questions 6 through 23) is unchanged from the NPRM, you may so indicate this in the space provided, rather than repeat the information.)*

6a. Describe the **unsafe condition**.

A Certain engine model [AEIO-360-B1G6] was omitted in the original issuance of the AD.

6b. Describe the **cause** of the unsafe condition.

There was no evidence of aircraft with the engine model being used in the existing fleet.

6c. Describe the occurrences that **prompted** this proposed AD action.

I/A

An inspector in Kentucky discovered the AD configuration was installed on at least two aircraft with the AEIO-360-B1G6 engine model and reported it to his geographic FSDO. About 9 other aircraft also have this model engine installed and may need AD compliance.

6d. How many such occurrences have been reported?

Two known aircraft. It is believed that there may be a total of 11 active aircraft in the fleet with this engine model installed.

6e. On what date did the FAA become aware of the situation?

March 30, 2004

7. Was this proposed action prompted by a manufacturer's quality control (QC) problem? If so, is a reporting requirement needed in the AD to determine the scope of the problem? *(If yes to either of these questions, coordinate with cognizant MIDO.)*

No

8. Was this proposed action prompted by the use of suspected unapproved parts (SUP)?

No

9. Is this action related to an NTSB safety recommendation? If yes, attach a copy of that recommendation and the FAA response.

No

10. If this proposed action will revise, supersede, or withdraw an existing AD, please provide the following information about the existing AD.

Amendment No.: 39-3580
Docket No.: 79-20-08
Federal Register Citation: Not available

- 11a. What are the proposed types of corrective actions (i.e., one-time inspections, recurring inspections, terminating actions, modifications, operational restrictions, etc.) **AND**
- What are the corresponding compliance times?

(See attached "SAMPLE: Proposed Corrective Action" for an example of how this information should be provided.)

- Have you considered all of the aspects of what you are proposing, such as overlapping requirements, the effect these actions will have on other existing requirements, and other sensitive issues? *(Be as specific as possible.)*

[Note to Word users: The area below is formatted as a "Table." It allows you to insert as much information as needed into each cell. To move to the next cell, use the Tab key.]

PROPOSED CORRECTIVE ACTION

NO CHANGE FROM ORIGINAL AD.

SERVICE INFORMATION (Attach 2 copies)	ACTION	INITIAL COMPLIANCE THRESHOLD	REPETITIVE INTERVAL (if any)	TERMINATING ACTION (if any)
--	--------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

11b. How was the compliance time(s) established?

Based on original time/ intervals for original AD.

11c. Has the manufacturer issued relevant service information? If so, attach 2 copies. *(Copies must be legible and of very good quality. Originals are preferred.)*

No.

11d. If this action relates to a non-U.S. product, has the foreign civil airworthiness authority (FCAA) issued a parallel AD? If yes, please provide the following information:

N/A

11e. Are there any differences between the manufacturer's service information referenced above, other AD's (foreign or U.S.), and the requirements of this AD? (For example, does the compliance time of this AD action differ significantly from that recommended in the referenced service information?) If so, explain these differences and the reasons for each.

NO

11f. Are notes, drawings, or diagrams needed in the AD to explain procedures or differences from the service instructions? (If so, please explain below or attach a copy.)

No

12. Number of aircraft/products that will be affected? (Use numerical figures).

Approx. 130 Domestic only

Approx. 131 [1in Australia] Worldwide (including domestic)

13. Provide the number of work hours/associated costs per aircraft/product for **EACH** proposed corrective action (i.e., inspection, modification, etc.) in the table below.

FOR THE **PROPOSED** AD:

No change from original AD

Type of Corrective Action	Number of Workhours per aircraft	Number of U.S. Aircraft Affected	Parts Costs per aircraft
---------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------

FOR THE **EXISTING** AD (i.e., the one to be superseded or revised), if applicable.

Type of Corrective Action	Number of Workhours per aircraft	Number of U.S. Aircraft Affected	Parts Costs per aircraft
---------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------

N/A

14. If parts are **required**, are they available for all aircraft?

Yes

15. If known, please indicate the number of affected aircraft that are already in compliance with the proposed inspection, modification, installation, or replacement, etc.

none

16. Should a special flight permit be:

Permitted

Permitted with limitations (*List the limitations on a separate sheet.*)

Prohibited

A ferry permit may be issued on a case by case basis.

17. In general, how is the product utilized (i.e., air carrier, general aviation, commuter, military, agri-business, training, etc.)?

General aviation

18a. If this proposed AD would revise or supersede an existing AD, have alternative methods of compliance (AMOC) been approved for the existing AD?

No

18b. If yes, should those AMOC's continue to be considered approved for all or any portion of the proposed AD?

N/A

18c. If yes, state for what portions of the proposed AD the previously approved AMOC's should continue to be considered approved.

N/A

19. With whom outside the FAA has this proposal been discussed (i.e., ATA, NBAA, RAA, AOPA, ALPA, GAMA, etc.)? *(A separate record may need to be submitted to the Rules Docket. See paragraph 3, "Ex parte Contacts," of the AD Manual.)*

NOTE: This item should be completed prior to submission of the AD Proposal Worksheet.

Organization	Person Contacted	Date	Reaction
Owner of Type Certificate	John Duncan	April 6, 2004	Notified of need for revision to AD and his concurrence
Aircraft Services	Mr. Ron Fortener Aircraft Inspector	March 30, 2004	Reported details of finding engine model with AD compliance
Kentucky FSDO Louisville, KY	Fred C. Seals	March 30, 2004	Notified ACO of inspector who discovered condition

20. Are there any special considerations or concerns that need to be taken into account in the drafting of this proposal? *(Use a separate sheet to detail these items, if necessary.)*

NO

21. Do you have reason to believe that this action would be considered "sensitive?" *(See Section 15 of the AD Manual for a definition of "sensitive".)* If yes, please explain below.

NO

22. Please indicate Yes or No to the following questions:

no Is this considered interim action?

no Do you know of any optional or alternative methods of accomplishing the proposed action?

Yes Have you considered any alternatives to an AD action?

No Are other Directorates involved in any similar actions?

No Does this action affect the Presidential fleet?

No Does this action affect the FAA fleet?

No Have the proposed procedures been verified (i.e., by MIDO, AEG, ACDO, FSDO)?

28. Check the category that best describes the cause of the unsafe condition addressed by this AD.

<input type="checkbox"/> Design Problem	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Control Problem	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Unapproved Parts	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)

Signature Section

(Signature indicates concurrence with proposed action)

Roger a. Caldwell 07/27/2004
 Project Engineer Date

Branch Manager Date
Melissa Johnson 8/2/04
 for ACO/Staff Office Manager Date

AEG Representative Date

MIDO Representative* Date
 (MIDO signature required if QC problem involved.)

*Enforcement action status? _____