stud every 100 hours time-in-service (TIS) thereafter,

• Measure the diameter of the mounting stud and if it is less than 5 mm (0.2 inch) increase the diameter to 6 mm (0.24 inch) in accordance with the procedure described in Glasflugel Technical Note (TN) 303–18, dated March 1, 1991,

• Incorporate a change to the Mosquito flight manual on page 19, paragraph 3.3 by inserting the following language in accordance with Glasflugal TN 303–9, dated June 22, 1979:

Whenever the canopy emergency jettison knob is pulled and prior to each flight, if no locking thread is used, it should be ensured that the Pip pines are fully pushed home, so that the locking balls are clear of and behind their fittings.

Initially, the compliance time of the proposed AD is in calendar time instead of hours time-in-service (TIS). The average monthly usage of the affected sailplanes ranges throughout the fleet. For example, one owner may operate the sailplane 25 hours in one week, while another operator may operate the sailplane 25 hours in one year. For this reason, the FAA has determined that, in order to ensure that all of the owners/operators of the affected sailplanes initially inspect the canopy system and incorporate the flight manual revisions within a reasonable amount of time, a calendar compliance time is proposed.

The FAA estimates that 40 sailplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 2 workhours per sailplane to accomplish the proposed action, and that the average labor rate is approximately $60 an hour. Parts cost approximately $10 per sailplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $5,200. This figure is based on the assumption that no affected owner/operator of the affected sailplanes has incorporated the proposed modification or accomplished the proposed inspection.

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 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, 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. 106(g); 40101, 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

Glasflugel: Docket No. 93–CE–02–AD.

Applicability; Model Mosquito Sailplanes (all serial numbers).

Note 1: This AD applies to each sailplane 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 sailplanes 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 (e) of this AD 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 sailplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required initially within the next 30 calendar days after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished, and repetitively inspect thereafter as indicated in the body of this AD.

To prevent canopy frame failure and emergency canopy deployment failure, which could result in loss of control of the sailplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Inspect the mounting studs on the canopy lifting/tilting frame for evidence of wear and diameter specifications in accordance with the recommendation in Glasflugel TN 303–18, dated March 1, 1991.

(1) If the mounting stud is worn or the diameter measures less than 5 mm (0.2 inch), prior to further flight, increase the diameter to 6 mm (0.24 inch) in accordance with the procedure described in Glasflugel Technical Note (TN) 303–18, dated March 1, 1991.

(2) Repeat the inspection specified in paragraph (a) of this AD and increase the diameter as necessary at intervals not to exceed 100 hours time-in-service (TIS).

(b) Incorporate the following language on page 19, paragraph 3.3 of the Mosquito flight manual in accordance with Glasflugel TN 303–9, dated June 22, 1979:

Whenever the canopy emergency jettison knob is pulled and prior to each flight, if no locking thread is used, it should be ensured that the Pip pins are fully pushed home, so that the locking balls are clear of and behind their fittings.

(c) Incorporating the flight manual revision as required by paragraph (b) of this AD may be performed by the owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7), and must be entered into the sailplane's records showing compliance with this AD in accordance with section 43.11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.11).

(d) 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 sailplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Small Airplane Directorate.

(f) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the documents referred to herein upon request to Glasflugel, c/o Hansjorg Streifeneder, Glasfaser-Flugzeug Service, Hofener Weg, D 72582 Grabenstetten, Germany, or may examine these documents at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on September 7, 1995.

Gerald W. Pierce,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–22922 Filed 9–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–131–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Models DC–9, DC–9–80, and MD–90–30 Series Airplanes, and Model MD–88 Airplanes, and C–9 (Military) Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an exiting airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes, that currently requires an inspection to detect chafing of or damage to the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit, application of spiral wrap to the wire bundle, and corrective actions, if necessary. That AD was prompted by reports of chafed and shorted wires that resulted in smoke emanating from the overhead switch panel of the cockpit. This action would expand the applicability of the rule to include certain Model DC–9, C–9 (military), and MD–90–30 series airplanes. This action also proposes to add a requirement to reroute the wire bundle to preclude chafing and damage. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent the potential for fire and uncontrolled smoke throughout the cockpit as a result of chafing and shorting in the electrical wire bundles.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 13, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–131–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 McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1–L51 (2–60). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: J. Kirk Baker, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5345; fax (310) 627–5210.

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 95–NM–131–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. 95–NM–131–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

On April 25, 1995, the FAA issued AD 95–09–10, amendment 39–9213 (60 FR 21977, May 4, 1995), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes. That AD requires a one-time visual inspection to detect chafing of or damage to the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit, application of spiral wrap to the wire bundle, repair of chafed wire insulation, and splicing of damaged wires. That action was prompted by reports of chafed and shorted wires that resulted in smoke emanating from the overhead switch panel of the cockpit. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent the potential for fire and uncontrolled smoke throughout the cockpit as a result of chafing and shorting in the electrical wire bundles.

In the preamble to AD 95–09–10, the FAA indicated that the required actions were considered to be interim action, and that additional rulemaking action was being considered to require modification (rerouting) of the wire bundles. The FAA also indicated that subsequent rulemaking action may be proposed to require the same actions that are required by AD 95–09–10 be applicable to certain Model DC–9, C–9 (military), and MD–90–30 series airplanes.

The FAA now has determined that certain Model DC–9, C–9 (military), and MD–90–30 series airplanes are subject to the same unsafe condition as Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes that were identified in the applicability of AD–95–09–10, The wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit is routed similarly in all of these airplanes and, therefore, the same potential for wire chafing and damage exists on all of these airplanes. Further, the FAA has determined the rerouting the wire bundles in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit on these airplanes will preclude the potential for fire and uncontrolled smoke throughout the cockpit .

Based on these determinations, the FAA finds that additional rulemaking is indeed necessary, and this proposed rule follows from these determinations.

Additionally, the FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglass MD–90 Alert Service Bullletin MD90–24A001, dated April 11, 1995, which describes procedures for a one-time visual inspection to detect chafing of the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit, application of spiral wrap, repair of chafed wire insulation, and splicing of damaged wires. This service bulletin pertains only to certain Model MD–90 series airplanes.

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 95–09–10 to continue to require a one-time visual inspection to detect chafing of or damage to the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit, application of spiral wrap to the wire bundle, repair of chafed wire insulation, and splicing of damaged wires. For certain Model MD–90–30 series airplanes, the actions would be

required to be accomplished in accordance with the alert service bulletin described previously. For certain Model DC–9, C–9 (military), DC–9–80 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes, the actions would continue to be required to be accomplished in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin DC9–24A157, dated April 11, 1995 (which was referenced in AD 95–09–10 as the appropriate source of service information).

Additionally, the proposed AD would add a requirement to reroute the wire bundle in accordance with a method approved by the FAA.

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.

There are approximately 2,012 Model DC–9, C–9 (military, DC–9–80, and MD–90–30 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 816 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. The proposed requirement to inspect and spiral wrap the wire bundle would take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish, and the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $5 per airplane. Based on these figures that total cost impact of these proposed actions on U.S. operators is estimated to be $185 per airplane.

The requirement to inspect and spiral wrap the wire bundle, specified in this proposed rule, was previously required by AD 95–09–10, which was applicable to 614 Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes of U.S. registry. Based on the figures discussed above, the total cost impact of the current requirements of that AD on U.S. operators of Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes is estimated to be $113,590. In consideration of the compliance time and effective date of AD 95–09–10, the FAA assumes that U.S. operators of airplanes that are subject to the requirements of that AD have already initiated the required actions. Therefore, the proposed action to inspect and spiral wrap the wire bundle would add no new costs associated with those airplanes.

However, this proposed action would also be applicable to approximately 202 Model DC–9, C–9 (military), and Model MD–9–30 series airplanes of U.S. registry. Based on the figures discussed above, the total new costs imposed by this proposal on U.S. operators of these airplanes are estimated to be $37,370. This figure is based on assumptions that no operator of these additional airplanes has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The newly proposed requirements of this AD action to reroute the wire bundle would be applicable to 816 Model DC–9, C–9 (military), DC–9–80, and Model MD–90–30 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes of U.S. registry. The proposed requirement to reroute the wire bundle would take approximately 0.5 work hour per airplane to accomplish, and the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $5 per airplane. Based on these figures the total cost impact of this proposed action on U.S. operators is estimated to be $28,560, or $35 per airplane.

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. 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–9213 (60 FR 21977, May 4, 1995), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 95–NM–131–AD. Supersedes AD 95–09–10, Amendment 39–9213.

Applicability: Models DC–9, C–9 (military), and DC–9–80 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin DC9–24A157, dated April 11, 1995; and Model MD–90–30 series airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD90–24A001, dated April 11, 1995; 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 (b) of this AD 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 the potential for fire and uncontrolled smoke throughout the cockpit, accomplish the follows:

(a) For Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes: Within 90 days after May 19, 1995 (the effective date of AD 95–09–10, amendment 39–9213), perform a

visual inspection to detect chafing of or damage to the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC9–24A157, dated April 11, 1995.

(1) If no chafing or damage is detected, prior to further flight, apply spiral wrap to the wire bundle in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

(2) If the wire insulation is chafed, prior to further flight, repair it and then apply spiral wrap to the wire bundle, in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

(3) If the wire conductor is damaged, prior to further flight, splice the wires and then apply spiral wrap to the wire bundle, in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

(b) For Model DC–9 and C–9 (military), and MD–90–30 series airplanes: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, perform a visual inspection to detect chafing of or damage to the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas CD–9 Alert Service Bulletin DC9–24A157, dated April 11, 1995 [for Model DC–9 and C–9 (military) series airplanes], or McDonnell Douglas MD–90 Alert Service Bulletin MD90–24A001, dated April 11, 1995 (for Model MD–90–30 series airplanes), as applicable.

(1) If no chafing or damage is detected, prior to further flight, apply spiral wrap to the wire bundle in accordance with the applicable alert service bulletin.

(2) If the wire insulation is chafed, prior to further flight, repair it and then apply spiral wrap to the wire bundle, in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

(3) If the wire conductor is damaged, prior to further flight, splice the wires and them apply spiral wrap to the wire bundle, in accordance with the applicable alert service bulletin.

(c) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, reroute the wire bundle in the overhead switch panel of the cockpit in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(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, Los Angeles 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, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Note 3: Alternative methods of compliance previously granted for amendment 39–9213, AD 95–09–10, continue to be considered as acceptable alternative methods of compliance with this amendment.

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

Issued in Renton, Washington, on September 11, 1995.

D.L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–22967 Filed 9–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–43–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Corporate Jets Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A and Model Hawker 800 and 1000 Series 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 Raytheon Corporate Jets Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A and Model Hawker 800 and 1000 series airplanes. This proposal would require an inspection to determine if the diode soldered connections are clean and functionally sound. This proposal would also require remake of the soldered connection and replacement of the diode with a new diode, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by reports of imperfect soldered connections in the engine starting and battery emergency control circuit. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent incorrect fault displays in the cockpit and intermittent fault symptoms in the engine starting and battery emergency control circuits, as a result of imperfect soldered connections.

DATES: Comments must be received by October 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–43–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 Raytheon Corporate Jets, Inc., Customer Support Department, Adams Field, P.O. Box 3356, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Backman, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2797; fax (206) 227–1149.

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 95–NM–43–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. 95–NM–43–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 Raytheon Corporate Jets Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A and Model Hawker 800 and 1000 series airplanes. The CAA advises that it has received reports of imperfect soldered connections in the engine starting and battery emergency control circuit. Such connections have led to fault symptoms of an intermittent nature in these circuits. This condition, if not corrected,