
(3) For service information identified in this AD, contact Hawker Beechcraft Corporation, 9709 East Central, Wichita, Kansas 67201; telephone: (316) 676–6034; fax: (316) 676–6614; Internet: https://www.hawkerbeechcraft.com/service_support/pubs/.

(4) You may review copies of the service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329–4148.

(5) You may also review copies of the service information that is incorporated by reference at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at an NARA facility, call 202–741–6030, or go to http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on July 7, 2011.

Earl Lawrence,
Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–17567 Filed 7–14–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39
RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace, Continuous Flow Passenger Oxygen Mask Assembly, Part Numbers 174006–( ), 174080–( ), 174085–( ), 174095–( ), 174097–( ), and 174098–( )

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above, except for those that are currently affected by similar action through any of five ADs applicable to Boeing products. This AD requires an inspection/records check to determine the manufacturer and part number of the oxygen mask assemblies installed, an inspection to determine the manufacturing date and modification status if certain oxygen mask assemblies are installed, and corrective action for certain oxygen mask assemblies. This AD was prompted by a report that several oxygen mask assemblies with broken in-line flow indicators were found following a mask deployment. We are issuing this AD to prevent the in-line flow indicators of the oxygen mask assembly from fracturing and separating, which could inhibit oxygen flow to the masks. This condition could consequently result in occupants developing hypoxia following a depressurization event.

DATES: This AD is effective August 19, 2011.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in the AD as of August 19, 2011.

ADDRESSES: For service information identified in this AD, contact B/E Aerospace, 10800 Pflumm Road, Lenexa, Kansas 66215; telephone: (913) 338–9800; fax: (913) 469–8419; Internet: http://www.beaerospace.com. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329–4148.

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 address for the Docket Office (phone: 800–647–5527) is Document Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
David Fairback, Aerospace Engineer, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946–4154; fax: (316) 946–4107; e-mail: david.fairback@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion
We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to the specified products. That NPRM was published in the Federal Register on February 23, 2011 (76 FR 9164). That NPRM proposed to require an inspection/records check to determine the manufacturer and part number of the oxygen mask assemblies installed, an inspection to determine the manufacturing date and modification status if certain oxygen mask assemblies are installed, and corrective action for certain oxygen mask assemblies.

Comments
We gave the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. The following presents the comments received on the proposal and the FAA’s response to each comment. B/E Aerospace supports the NPRM.

Request To Address Past Production Cut Over Point Airplanes
The Boeing Company (Boeing) stated that a statement should be included in the final rule AD action to address installation of the affected oxygen mask assemblies on Boeing airplanes that are not included in existing Boeing service bulletins because these airplanes are past production cut over point. Boeing stated that, due to long time lag between production cut over change and the release of the AD, there is a high likelihood that on Boeing airplanes past production cut over point, but prior to release of this AD due to lack of awareness of the pending AD release, operators could have installed one of the affected oxygen mask assemblies during routine maintenance. The Applicability section of the proposed AD could mislead operators to not take corrective actions on Boeing airplanes even if they had unknowingly installed affected oxygen mask assemblies on airplanes past production cut over prior to release of the AD. This could also apply to installation of affected oxygen mask assemblies on Boeing airplanes through supplemental type certificate (STC) or through field approval.

We agree with the commenter. However, the unsafe condition on Boeing airplanes will be addressed separately from this AD. If additional action is necessary to address Boeing’s concerns, additional rulemaking may be taken specific to Boeing airplanes.

We have not changed the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Request for Applicability Clarification
Boeing stated that there is confusion between the statements in the Differences Between the Proposed AD and the Service Information section and the Applicability section in the proposed AD. The statements are contradictory and could mislead operators. In the proposed AD, it is stated in the Differences Between the Proposed AD and the Service Information section that oxygen mask
work should be avoided and that credit
indicators. We do agree that duplicate
part numbers that contain the
include all of the oxygen mask assembly
AD because the EASA AD does not
commenters. We do not agree to exclude
the FAA AD and avoid duplicate work.
This may have caused.
and the Service-information section,
Proposed AD and the Service
Application section provides relief for
Boeing airplanes covered by the
previously referenced ADs. This
information is contradictory and needs
to be clarified in the final rule AD
action.
We agree with the commenter. The
statement in the Differences Between the
Proposed AD and the Service
Information section is incorrect. The
template used for preparing final rule
AD actions does not include the
Differences Between the Proposed AD and the Service
Information section, which is part of the Discussion section
and not part of the actual AD. The
Application section in the proposed
AD is correct. We regret any confusion
this may have caused.
We have not changed the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Request To Exclude Certain Airplanes
From the Applicability Section

Airbus, jetBlue Airways, and All
Nippon Airways stated Airbus airplanes in compliance with B/E Aerospace
Service Bulletin 174080–35–02, Rev. 1,
as specified in European Aviation Safety
Agency (EASA) AD 2010–0165, dated
August 5, 2010, should be excluded
from the applicability of the proposed
AD.

The commenters state that this change
would harmonize the EASA AD with the
FAA AD and avoid duplicate work.
We partially agree with the
commenters. We do not agree to exclude
Airbus airplanes affected by the EASA
AD because the EASA AD does not
include all of the oxygen mask assembly
part numbers that contain the
potentially defective in-line flow
indicators. We do agree that duplicate
work should be avoided and that credit
for compliance with the EASA AD
could be given, but only if it can be
positively determined that no oxygen
mask assembly part number listed in
B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–
35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6,
2010, or listed in EASA AD 2010–0165,
dated August 5, 2010, is installed by
STC or alternation.
We have revised the final rule AD
action to include a statement in
paragraph (g)(1) giving conditional
credit for compliance with the EASA
AD 2010–0165, dated August 5, 2010,
or EASA AD 2010–0165R1, correction

Request To Allow an Additional
Method of Compliance

Airbus stated that compliance with
the final rule AD action should include
inspection of the oxygen mask assembly
container for a manufacture date of
oxygen mask assemblies that were fitted
time of production delivery providing
that no replacement of masks occurred
up to the effective date of the final rule
AD action.

Airbus stated that they received a
statement from B/E Aerospace stating
that “container assemblies that were
manufactured after March 1, 2006, do
not contain masks that were
manufactured before March 1, 2006.”
Airbus confirms that no modification is
performed on the container assemblies
and/or subassemblies before aircraft
delivery.

We partially agree with the
commenter. We agree that inspection of
the oxygen mask assembly container for
manufacture date is adequate only if it
can be verified that the original oxygen
masks in the container assembly are
installed. We disagree that relying on
the container assembly manufacture
date alone addresses the safety concern
because the masks in the container
assembly may have been changed after
it was manufactured.
We have revised the final rule AD
action based on this comment to include
inspection of the container assembly
date only if it can be positively
determined that the passenger oxygen
masks within the container assembly
have not been modified since it was
manufactured.

Request To Change Replacement
Compliance Time

Airbus stated that replacement of the
in-line flow indicator in their passenger
oxygen masks several years before 2002
when the AVOX part number 804273–
01 was introduced. The B/E Aerospace
part number 118023–02 in-line flow
indicator is not glued; it is welded
gether. The photos provided by BOS
Aviation Ltd. show that the failure was
where the two halves are glued together,
not as was suggested at the “weak”
sharp molded joint stated in the B/E
Aerospace service bulletin and other
communication.
We do not agree with the commenter.
AVOX stopped using the B/E Aerospace
in-line flow indicator in their passenger
oxygen masks several years before 2002
when the AVOX part number 804273–
01 was introduced. The B/E Aerospace
part number 118023–02 in-line flow
indicator is not glued; it is welded
together. The photos provided by BOS
Aviation Ltd. show that the failure did
not occur at the weld since the opaque
material is still bonded to the
transparent material.

The FAA issued Special Alert
Information Bulletin (SAIB) NM–11–25
to address an issue with AVOX in-line
flow indicators that is different from the
B/E Aerospace in-line flow indicators.
We have not changed the final rule AD
action based on this comment.

Request To Include Other In-Line Flow
Indicators in the Applicability Section

BOS Aviation Ltd. stated that the
Applicability section should also
include additional in-line flow indicator
part numbers because faulty in-line flow
indicators are fitted to more masks than
identified in B/E Aerospace Service
Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated
September 6, 2010. BOS Aviation Ltd.
stated that some technical
documentation suggests that a very
popular series of AVOX oxygen masks
contain the same in-line flow indicator,
although it masquerades under AVOX
part number 804273–01. They also
stated that examination of the failure
mode of the suspect in-line flow
indicator showed that the failure was
where the two halves are glued together,
not as was suggested at the “weak”
sharp molded joint stated in the B/E
Aerospace service bulletin and other
communication.
We do not agree with the commenter.

Airbus confirmed that no modification is
making the affected oxygen masks
should be changed to 36 months after
the effective date of the AD or within
6,500 hours time-in-service (TIS) after
the effective date of the AD, whichever
occurs first.

We agree with the commenter.
Changing the compliance time for
modifying the affected oxygen masks
will still address the safety concern of
the unsafe condition identified in the
proposed AD.

We have revised the final rule AD
action to change the replacement/
modification compliance time in
paragraph (h).

Request To Include Other Oxygen Mask
Assemblies in the Applicability Section

BOS Aviation Ltd. stated that the
Applicability section should also
include additional in-line flow indicator
part numbers because faulty in-line flow
indicators are fitted to more masks than
identified in B/E Aerospace Service
Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated
September 6, 2010. BOS Aviation Ltd.
stated that some technical
documentation suggests that a very
popular series of AVOX oxygen masks
contain the same in-line flow indicator,
although it masquerades under AVOX
part number 804273–01. They also
stated that examination of the failure
mode of the suspect in-line flow
indicator showed that the failure was
where the two halves are glued together,
not as was suggested at the “weak”
sharp molded joint stated in the B/E
Aerospace service bulletin and other
communication.
We do not agree with the commenter.

AVOX stopped using the B/E Aerospace
in-line flow indicator in their passenger
oxygen masks several years before 2002
when the AVOX part number 804273–
01 was introduced. The B/E Aerospace
part number 118023–02 in-line flow
indicator is not glued; it is welded
together. The photos provided by BOS
Aviation Ltd. show that the failure did
not occur at the weld since the opaque
material is still bonded to the
transparent material.

The FAA issued Special Alert
Information Bulletin (SAIB) NM–11–25
to address an issue with AVOX in-line
flow indicators that is different from the
B/E Aerospace in-line flow indicators.
We have not changed the final rule AD
action based on this comment.

Request To Include Other In-Line Flow
Indicators in the Applicability Section

BOS Aviation Ltd. stated that the
manufacturer date window be removed
from the final rule AD action because
several suspect part number in-line flow
indicators are in service that were
manufactured before the January 1, 2002
We do not agree with the commenter. Based on the failure data we have, we determined that no AD action is necessary for other in-line flow indicators or for in-line flow indicators manufactured before 2002.

We have not changed the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Request To Show Compliance Through Permanent Marking

BOS Aviation Ltd. requested that the personal safety unit (PSU) (as well as the actual oxygen mask assembly) be marked to show compliance with the AD: thereby negating the need to open the PSU and drop the oxygen mask assembly to confirm compliance in the future.

We partially agree with the commenter. We agree that the oxygen mask assembly needs to be marked to show it has been modified as specified in the service bulletin. However, we do not agree to require marking of the oxygen mask storage container to show compliance with the AD when compliance can be confirmed by checking the maintenance records.

We have not changed the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Request To Add Additional Guidance

BOS Aviation Ltd. stated that the FAA should instruct owner/operators to use standard maintenance practices when doing the actions required in the final rule AD action. This should be done for a myriad of good reasons that relate primarily to safety, none of which goes away simply because the maintenance is carried out as a result of an AD or a service bulletin.

We partially agree with the commenter. We agree that standard maintenance practices should always be used. Appropriate personnel and procedures must be used for the inspection and modification required by this AD to ensure safety and not create additional hazards. We disagree that language should be added to the AD to emphasize safety when doing actions required in an AD.

We have not changed the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Request To Update Cost of Compliance Section

BOS Aviation Ltd. stated that B/E Aerospace has offered to supply replacement in-line flow indicators to operators free of charge. The FAA assessed the cost of compliance based on the manpower requirement stated in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2011, and is grossly underestimated. In many applications, the suspect oxygen masks are contained in a PSU that is live and installed in operational aircraft. The proposed AD requires opening and disassembling the oxygen mask assembly in order to carry out the inspection, in addition to modifying any defective oxygen mask. To do this task safely and following various manufacturers’ maintenance instructions, the oxygen mask assembly should be removed from the aircraft, taken to an oxygen clean environment, and made safe in preparation for maintenance.

Once open, depending on type, the oxygen mask assemblies are tightly wrapped with their tube specifically coiled and packaged with the in-line flow indicator not immediately visible, which then requires “unpacking” the box that may contain up to four masks. The box then requires proper “re-packing” before reinstallation and test in the aircraft.

BOS Aviation Ltd. stated that they have conducted tests that would suggest the accomplishment time (as presented in AD 2007–26–06 for example) is probably adequate for an aircraft of a half or a third the capacity of the 747. Moreover, where aircraft PSU's use chemical oxygen generators, the issue to ensure safety with respect to the oxygen generating canister becomes paramount and increases the workhours required. Our estimate, at the very best, for accomplishing the AD on an airplane’s set of PSUs on a 150 seat narrow body airplane, will require a minimum of 3 days down time, not including transport of the PSUs to a suitable workshop for accomplishment of the AD.

We do not agree with the commenter. The cost estimate of $19,400.00 for the estimated number of affected oxygen mask assemblies is based on the following:

- The cost estimate for the AD assumes that all of the 400,000 part number in-line flow indicators manufactured on or after January 1, 2002, and before March 1, 2006, are replaced for compliance with this AD. In reality, most of these in-line flow indicators are installed in Boeing and Airbus airplanes and will be replaced in compliance with the previously referenced ADs. The exact number that will be replaced in accordance with this AD is unknown, but it will be less than the estimated 400,000.
- The cost estimate assumes 30 minutes are required to do the actions required in this AD for each affected oxygen mask assembly. This estimate is much higher than the 3-minute time proposed in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010.
- For the oxygen mask assemblies to be maintained in an airworthy condition, a recurrent inspection for each oxygen mask is necessary. The 6,500-hour ‘TIS/36-month compliance time of this AD will allow many operators to do the actions required in this AD at the same time as the recurrent inspection.

We have not changed the final rule AD action based on this comment.

Conclusion

We reviewed the relevant data, considered the comments received, and determined that air safety and the public interest require adopting the AD with the changes described previously and minor editorial changes. We have determined that these minor changes:

- Are consistent with the intent that was proposed in the NPRM for correcting the unsafe condition; and
- Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM.

We also determined that these changes will not increase the economic burden on any operator or increase the scope of the AD.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this AD affects 400,000 oxygen mask assemblies.

We estimate the following costs to comply with this AD:
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, 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

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):


Effective Date

(a) This AD is effective August 19, 2011.

Affected ADs

(b) None. This AD does not revise or supersede any existing ADs. The following ADs address the unsafe condition described in paragraph (e) of this AD for certain installations on certain Boeing airplanes:


Compliance

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

Records Check/Inspection

(g) Within 36 months after August 19, 2011 (the effective date of this AD) or within 6,500 hours time-in-service (TIS) after August 19, 2011 (the effective date of this AD), whichever occurs first, do the following:

(1) Do a records check to determine if any oxygen mask assembly part number listed in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010, is installed in the aircraft.

(i) If you cannot positively determine the manufacturer and part number of any oxygen mask assembly installed, do a general visual inspection to determine if any oxygen mask assembly part number listed in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010, is installed in the aircraft.

(ii) If you can positively determine that no oxygen mask assembly part number listed in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010, is installed, no further action is required by this AD.

(iii) If you can positively determine that any Airbus airplane affected by this AD is in compliance with European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2010–0165, dated August 5, 2010, or EASA AD 2010–0165R1, corrected dated January 31, 2011, and that no oxygen mask assembly part number listed in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010 is
installed by STC or alteration, no further action is required by this AD.

(iv) If you can positively determine through inspection of the oxygen mask container assembly that the date of manufacture is after March 1, 2006, and you can positively determine that the oxygen mask assembly in the container assembly are installed, no further action is required by this AD.

(2) If, as a result of any of the records checks/inspections required in paragraph (g)(1) of this AD, you determine that an oxygen mask assembly part number listed in B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010, is installed, inspect the oxygen mask assembly to determine if the in-line flow indicator must be replaced following paragraph II.A. of B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010. If you can positively determine that the in-line flow indicator does not require replacement, no further action is required by this AD.

Modification/Replacement

(h) After the inspection in paragraph (g)(2) of this AD and it was determined the in-line flow indicator must be replaced, within 36 months after August 19, 2011 (the effective date of this AD) or within 6,500 hours TIS after August 19, 2011 (the effective date of this AD), whichever occurs first, modify the oxygen mask assembly by replacing the in-line flow indicator following B/E Aerospace Service Bulletin 174080–35–04, Rev 000, dated September 6, 2010, with the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of the service information under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact B/E Aerospace, 10800 Pflumm Road, Lenexa, Kansas 66215; telephone: (913) 338–9800; fax: (913) 469–8419; Internet: http://www.beaerospace.com.

(3) You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 816–329–4148.

(4) You may also review copies of the referenced service information that is incorporated by reference at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at a NARA facility, call 202–741–6030, or go to http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on July 1, 2011

Earl Lawrence,
Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–17205 Filed 7–14–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39


RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747–400 and –400D Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This AD requires a general visual inspection to determine the routing of the wire bundles in the number two and three number three engine pylons near the leading edge, and related investigative and corrective actions if necessary. For certain airplanes, this AD also requires certain concurrent actions. This AD was prompted by a report of a fuel leak from the main fuel feed tube at the number two engine pylons. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct chafing of the fuel feed tube and the alternating current motor-driven hydraulic pump wire bundle, which could lead to arcing from the exposed wire to the fuel feed tube, and could result in a fire or explosion.

DATES: This AD is effective August 19, 2011.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the AD as of August 19, 2011.

ADDRESSES: For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Data & Services Management, P.O. Box 3707, MC 2H–65, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207; telephone: 206–544–5000, extension 1; fax: 206–766–5680; e-mail me.boecom@boeing.com; Internet: https://www.myboeingfleet.com. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW, Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

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 address for the Docket Office (phone: 800–647–5527) is Document Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tung Tran, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANM–140S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98057–3356; phone: 425–917–6505; fax: 425–917–6590; e-mail: tung.tran@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: