under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained 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, pursuant to 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. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Boeing: Docket 94–NM–133–AD.

Applicability: Model 757 series airplanes equipped with Pratt & Whitney PW2000 engines, as listed in Boeing Service Bulletin 757–76–0010, dated August 12, 1993; and Model 757 series airplanes equipped with Rolls-Royce RB211–535 engines, as listed in Boeing Service Bulletin 757–76–0011, dated December 2, 1993; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (c) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent false indications of engine fuel valve faults, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes equipped with Pratt & Whitney PW2000 engines: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, modify the engine fuel valve indication circuits in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 757–76–0010, dated August 12, 1993.

(b) For airplanes equipped with Rolls-Royce RB211–535 engines: Within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, accomplish the modifications specified in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this AD. The modification specified in paragraph (b)(1) must be accomplished either prior to or concurrently with the modification specified in paragraph (b)(2). In any case, both modifications must be completed within 18 months after the effective date of this AD.

(1) Modify the engine fuel shutoff valve control in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 757–76–0007, Revision 2, dated January 23, 1992.

Note 2: Accomplishment of this modification prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 757–76–0007 (original issue), dated February 22, 1990, or Revision 1, dated October 31, 1991, is considered acceptable for compliance with paragraph (b)(1) of this AD.

(2) Modify the engine fuel valve indication circuits in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 757–76–0011, dated December 2, 1993.

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

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Seattle ACO.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 30, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–13784 Filed 6–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–ANE–32]

Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard 14RF, 247F, 14SF, and 6/5500/F Series Propellers

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to Hamilton Standard 14RF, 247F, 14SF, and 6/5500/F (formerly Hamilton Standard/British Aerospace 6/5500/F) series propellers, that currently requires initial and repetitive inspections of the propeller control unit (PCU) servo ballscrew internal spline (BIS) teeth for wear, and replacement, if necessary, of PCU servo BIS assemblies. This proposed AD would increase the repetitive PCU servo BIS teeth inspection interval from 1,500 to 2,500 hours time in service (TIS) for propellers that have a ballscrew quill damper installed. In addition, this proposed AD would add an optional terminating action to the repetitive PCU servo BIS teeth inspections by installing a Secondary Drive Quill (SDQ). If an SDQ is installed, this proposed AD would require initial and repetitive torque check inspections of the primary ballscrew quill. This proposal is prompted by field service and laboratory test data that indicate that the repetitive inspection interval can be safely increased, and by the development and availability of the SDQ. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent inability to control the propeller blade angle due to tooth wear in the PCU servo BIS assembly.

DATES: Comments must be received by July 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–ANE–32, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Hamilton Standard, One Hamilton Road, Windsor Locks, CT 06096–1010. This information may be examined at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Walsh, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (617) 238–7158, fax (617) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the

proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 95–ANE–32.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–ANE–32, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299.

Discussion

On October 26, 1994, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued AD 94–22–12, Amendment 39–9062 (59 FR 55199, November 4, 1994), applicable to Hamilton Standard 14RF, 247F, 14SF, and 6/5500/F (formerly Hamilton Standard/British Aerospace 6/5500/F) series propellers, to increase the repetitive inspection interval from 500 to 1,500 hours time in service (TIS) since last inspection for propellers that have a ballscrew quill damper installed. That action was prompted by the availability of improved hardware that restricts quill motion and enhances the lubrication of the BIS and significantly reduces BIS wear. Severe wear of the BIS affects the ability to control the propeller blade angle. That condition, if not corrected, could result in inability to control the propeller blade angle due to tooth wear in the PCU servo BIS assembly.

Since the issuance of that AD, the FAA has received field service data and additional data accumulated on six controlled PCU's. These six controlled PCU's show no BIS wear in more than 2,500 hours TIS for PCU's with ballscrew quill dampers installed.

In addition, Hamilton Standard has developed redundant design hardware that incorporates a secondary drive path for control between the PCU and the propeller oil transfer tube. This redundant hardware is known as the Secondary Drive Quill (SDQ) installation. The SDQ is currently being installed on new production PCU's. For in-service PCU's, this SDQ installation, accomplished by service bulletin at field repair stations, is optional; however, this proposed AD makes installation of the SDQ terminating action to the repetitive PCU servo BIS teeth inspections. With the SDQ installed, this proposed AD would require initial and repetitive torque check inspections of the primary ballscrew quill.

The FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of the following Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletins (ASB's), all dated May 5, 1995: No. 14SF–61–A59, Revision 6; No. 14RF–9–61–A53, Revision 7; No. 14RF–19–61–A25, Revision 6; No. 14RF–21–61–A38, Revision 6; No. 247F–61–A3, Revision 5; and No. 6/5500/F–61–A11, Revision 6. These ASB's enable affected propellers with a ballscrew quill damper installed in production or in accordance with the following Hamilton Standard Service Bulletins (SB's), all dated September 27, 1994, to extend the repetitive PCU servo BIS teeth inspection interval from 500 to 2,500 hours TIS since last inspection: No. 14SF–61–67, Revision 2; No. 14RF–9–61–61, Revision 1; No. 14RF–19–61–29, Revision 2; No. 14RF–21–61–48, Revision 2; No. 247F–61–6, Revision 2; and No. 6/5500/F–61–19, Revision 2.

In addition, the FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of the following Hamilton Standard SB's, all Revision 1, all dated May 17, 1995: No. 14SF–61–82; No. 14RF–9–61–76; No. 14RF–19–61–43; No. 14RF–21–61–62; No. 247F–61–13; and No. 6/5500/F–61–33. These SB's describe procedures for installing the SDQ.

Also, the FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of the following Hamilton Standard SB's, all Revision 1, dated May 17, 1995; No. 14SF–61–81; No. 14RF–9–61–75; No. 14RF–19–61–41; No. 14RF–21–61–60; No. 247F–61–12; and No. 6/5500/F–61–33. These SB's describe procedures for initial and repetitive torque check inspections of the primary ballscrew quill if the SDQ is installed.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 94–22–12 to increase the repetitive PCU servo BIS teeth inspection interval from 1,500 to 2,500 TIS for propellers that have a ballscrew quill damper installed. In addition, this proposed AD would add an optional terminating action to the repetitive PCU servo BIS teeth inspections by installing a SDQ. With the SDQ installed, this proposed AD would require an initial torque check inspection of the primary ballscrew quill at 5,000 hours TIS since installation of the SDQ, and thereafter repetitive torque check inspections at intervals not to exceed 5,000 hours TIS since last inspection.

There are approximately 2,506 propellers of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 1,150 propellers installed on aircraft of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1.5 work hours per propeller to accomplish the PCU servo BIS teeth inspections, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, and on the average utilization rate of 2,000 hours TIS per year equating to 1.3 inspections per year, the total cost impact of the current AD per year on U.S. operators is estimated to be $134,550. However, this proposed superseding AD would require only 0.8 inspections per year, resulting in an approximate yearly inspection cost of $82,800, which would provide an approximate yearly savings to U.S. operators of $51,750.

The optional terminating action would require 4 work hours to install the SDQ, and required parts would cost approximately $5,500 per propeller. With the SDQ installed, the proposed AD would require initial and repetitive torque check inspections of the primary ballscrew quill. The torque check inspection would take 3 work hours to perform the required actions, and with an average utilization rate of 2,000 hours TIS per year equating to 0.4 inspections per year, resulting in an approximate yearly inspection cost of $72 per propeller.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects 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, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the 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 is contained 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, pursuant to 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. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–9062 (59 FR 55199, November 4,1994) and by adding a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

Hamilton Standard: Docket No. 95–ANE–32. Supersedes AD 94–22–12, Amendment 39–9062.

Applicability: Hamilton Standard Models 14RF–9, 14RF–19, 14RF–21, and 14RF–23; 247F–1; 14SF–5, 14SF–7, 14SF–11, 14SFL11, 14SF–15, 14SF–17, 14SF–19, 14SF–23; and 6/5500/F propellers installed on but not limited to Embraer EMB–120 and EMB–120RT; SAAB–SCANIA SF340B; Aerospatiale ATR42–100, ATR42–300, ATR42–320, ATR72, ATR72–210; DeHavilland DHC–8–100 series, DHC–8–300; Construcciones Aeronauticas SA (CASA) CN–235 and CN–235–100; Canadair CL215T and CL415; and British Aerospace ATP airplanes.

Note: This AD applies to each propeller identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For propellers that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (d) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition, or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any propeller from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent the inability to control the propeller blade angle due to tooth wear in the propeller control unit (PCU) servo ballscrew internal spline (BIS) assembly, accomplish the following:

(a) Inspect the PCU servo BIS assembly for tooth wear in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of the following Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletins (ASB), all dated May 5, 1995, as applicable: No. 14RF–9–61–A53, Revision 7; No. 14RF–19–61–A25, Revision 6; No. 14RF–21–61–A38, Revision 6; No. 247F–61–A3, Revision 5; No. 14SF–61–A59, Revision 6; and No. 6/5500/F–61–A11, Revision 6; as follows:

(1) For a PCU with unknown time in service (TIS), and unknown TIS since the last inspection, on the effective date of this airworthiness directive (AD), and that does not have a ballscrew quill damper installed, inspect within 200 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD.

(2) For a PCU with 1,800 or more hours TIS or unknown TIS on the effective date of this AD, and either has not been inspected, or has been inspected more than 500 hours prior to the effective date of this AD, in accordance with the applicable Hamilton Standard ASB listed in paragraph (a) of this AD; and that does not have a ballscrew quill damper installed; inspect within 200 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD.

(3) For a PCU with 1,800 or more hours TIS or unknown TIS on the effective date of this AD, and that has been inspected within the previous 500 hours TIS in accordance with the applicable Hamilton Standard ASB listed in paragraph (a) of this AD, and that does not have a ballscrew quill damper installed, inspect within 500 hours TIS since the last inspection in accordance with the applicable Hamilton Standard ASB listed in paragraph (a) of this AD.

(4) For a PCU with less than 1,800 hours TIS on the effective date of this AD, and that does not have a ballscrew quill damper installed, inspect prior to accumulating 1,800 hours TIS, or within 300 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(5) For a PCU that has a ballscrew quill damper installed in production or in accordance with the following applicable Hamilton Standard Service Bulletins (SB), all dated September 27, 1994, or previous revisions: No. 14SF–61–67, Revision 2; No. 14RF–9–61–61, Revision 1; No. 14RF–19–61–29, Revision 2; No. 14RF–21–61–48, Revision 2; No. 247F–61–6, Revision 2; and No. 6/5500/F–61–19, Revision 2; inspect within 2,500 hours TIS since installation of the ballscrew quill damper

(6) Thereafter, inspect at intervals described as follows:

(i) For propellers that have a ballscrew quill damper installed in production or in accordance with the applicable Hamilton Standard SB listed in paragraph (a)(5) of this AD, or previous revisions, inspect at intervals not to exceed 2,500 hours TIS since the last inspection required by this AD.

(ii) For propellers that do not have a ballscrew quill damper installed in production or in accordance with the applicable Hamilton Standard SB listed in paragraph (a)(5) of this AD, inspect at intervals not to exceed 500 hours TIS since the last inspection required by this AD.

(7) If PCU servo BIS teeth are worn beyond the limits specified in the Accomplishment Instructions of the applicable ASB's listed in paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, replace the PCU with a serviceable assembly in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of the applicable ASB's listed in paragraph (a) of this AD, and thereafter reinspect in accordance with paragraphs (a)(6) and (a)(7) of this AD.

(b) Operators have the option of installing a Secondary Drive Quill (SDQ) in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of the following applicable Hamilton Standard SB's, all Revision 1, all dated May 17, 1995: No. 14SF–61–82; No. 14RF–9–61–76; No. 14RF–19–61–43; No. 14RF–21–61–62; No. 247F–61–13; and No. 6/5500/F–61–33. Installation of an SDQ constitutes terminating action to the repetitive inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD.

(c) With an SDQ installed, perform an initial torque check inspection of the primary ballscrew quill at 5,000 hours TIS since installation of the SDQ, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,000 hours TIS since last inspection, and remove from service and replace with a serviceable part, if necessary, in accordance with the following applicable Hamilton Standard SB's, all Revision 1, dated May 17, 1995: No. 14SF–61–81; No. 14RF–9–61–75; No. 14RF–19–61–41; No. 14RF–21–61–60; No. 247F–61–12; and No. 6/5500/F–61–33.

(d) 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, Boston Aircraft Certification Office. The request should be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office.

Note: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Boston Aircraft Certification Office.

(e) 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 aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on May 30, 1995.

James C. Jones,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–13785 Filed 6–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94–NM–139–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model ATP Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Jetstream Model ATP airplanes. This proposal would require modification of certain doors. This proposal is prompted by a report that an operator was unable to unlock a Type I passenger door due to migration of a shootbolt bush. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such migration, which could jam the Type I passenger door, and subsequently could delay or impede the evacuation of passengers during an emergency.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 26, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–139–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Jetstream Aircraft, Inc., P.O. Box 16029, Dulles International Airport, Washington, DC 20041–6029. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Schroeder, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2148; fax (206) 227–1320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 94–NM–139–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–139–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is the airworthiness authority for the United Kingdom, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Jetstream Model ATP airplanes. The CAA advises it has received a report indicating that an operator was unable to unlock a Type I passenger door. Investigation revealed that shootbolt bush had migrated. This shootbolt bush is also located in the aft baggage door. This condition, if not corrected, could jam the Type I passenger door, which could delay or impede the evacuation of passengers during an emergency.

Jetstream has issued Service Bulletin ATP–52–26–10350B, dated June 29, 1994, which describes procedures for modification of the Type I passenger doors and the aft baggage door. This modification involves installation of locking pins at the shootbolt bush housings of the doors. Accomplishment of the modification ensures that the latching and locking mechanism of the doors cannot become jammed. The CAA classified this service bulletin as mandatory in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in the United Kingdom.

This airplane model is manufactured in the United Kingdom and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of § 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the CAA has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the CAA, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require modification of the Type I passenger doors and aft baggage door. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

As a result of recent communications with the Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, the FAA has learned that, in general, some operators may misunderstand the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. The FAA points out that all airplanes identified in the applicability provision of an AD are legally subject to the AD. If an airplane has been altered or repaired in the affected area in such a way as to affect compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been included in this notice to clarify this long-standing requirement.

The FAA estimates that 10 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 35 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. The cost of the required parts would be nominal. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is