

could become a potential hazard. The criteria include hazards due to decompression, aerodynamic interference, interaction with other systems or structure (for example, through the door departing the airplane and impacting an engine or control surface). For the purposes of this determination, opening by persons is treated separately from the tendency of the door to remain closed when under pressure. However, both are considerations that must be satisfied to determine that the door is not a hazard.

Proposed Changes to § 25.783(i)

The current requirements of paragraph (i) that apply to the design of air stairs (integral stair installed in a passenger entry door that is qualified as a passenger emergency exit) would be removed from existing § 25.783 and added in § 25.810 ("Emergency egress assist means and escape routes") as a new paragraph (e), without change in text. The FAA considers that manufacturers, applicants, and others seeking compliance with rules would be better served by having these requirements located in the same section of the rules where other related requirements are found.

Proposed Changes to § 25.783(j)

The special requirement for lavatory doors contained in current paragraph (j) would be removed and placed in a new § 25.820 ("Lavatory doors"), with only minor editorial changes in text. The FAA considers that less confusion will be caused, and the regulated public will be better served, if all requirements about this particular subject are located in one separate place.

Other Proposed Changes

Several other provisions currently in § 25.783 would be deleted, since they duplicate the requirements applicable to emergency exit design that are contained in, or would be moved without substantive change to, other sections of part 25. The FAA considers that less confusion would be caused, and that the regulated public would be better served, if all requirements concerning a particular subject are located in one place. The FAA proposes the following specific changes:

§ 25.809(b) ("Emergency exit arrangement"):

This paragraph would be revised by adding a new paragraph (b)(3) to require that each emergency exit must be capable of being opened, when there is no fuselage deformation, "even though persons may be crowded against the door on the inside of the airplane." This specific requirement is currently a part

of § 25.783(b), but is more appropriate as part of the emergency exit arrangement requirements of § 25.809.

§ 25.809(c):

This paragraph would be revised to include the requirement that the means of opening emergency exits also must be marked so it can be readily located and operated, even in darkness. This requirement is currently located in § 25.783(b), but is more appropriate as part of the emergency exit arrangement requirements of § 25.809.

§ 25.809(f):

This paragraph would be revised to require that the external door be located where persons using it will not be endangered by the propellers when appropriate operating procedures are used. This requirement currently is found in § 25.783(d), but is more applicable to the emergency exit arrangement requirements of § 25.809. Existing § 25.809(f) is redundant with the requirements for locking mechanisms contained in § 25.783.

In addition, the FAA is also proposing to correct an error in the current regulations as follows:

§ 25.807 ("Emergency exits"):

Existing § 25.783 requires that passenger entry doors also meet the airworthiness standards required for emergency exits. In addition, the current JAR 25.807, issued by the European JAA, requires that certain other fuselage doors, as well as passenger entry doors, meet the same standards as emergency exits. Before the adoption of Amendment 25-88 (61 FR 57956, November 8, 1996), part 25 also contained a requirement similar to that of JAR 25.807; however, that requirement was unintentionally omitted when Amendment 25-88 was adopted. This proposed rule would correct this discrepancy by setting forth this requirement in a revised § 25.807(h), and by revising § 25.783 to refer to that section.

Specifically, the proposed § 25.807(h) would be revised to refer to "other exits" that must meet the applicable emergency exit requirements of §§ 25.809 through 25.812. Those exits include:

- Each emergency exit in the passenger compartment in excess of the minimum number of required emergency exits;
- Floor-level doors or exits that are accessible from the passenger compartment and larger than a Type II exit, but less than 46 inches wide; and
- Other ventral or tail cone passenger exits.

This provision is intended to address doors or other means of egress accessible from the passenger cabin. The

width limit of 46 inches was derived from cargo doors that have been installed in smaller transport category airplanes. That is, cargo doors are not required to be exits. However, this provision does not relieve any emergency exit for which passenger credit is received from any of the applicable requirements.

Is Existing FAA Advisory Material Adequate?

The FAA also proposes to revise AC 25.783-1. The revised AC would describe an acceptable means, but not the only means, for complying with the proposed revised regulations described in this NPRM. The AC would provide guidance for showing compliance with structural and functional safety standards for doors and their operating systems. The availability of the proposed AC revision for public comment will be announced in the **Federal Register** in the near future.

What Regulatory Analyses and Assessments Has the FAA Conducted?

Regulatory Evaluation Summary

Proposed changes to Federal regulations must undergo several economic analyses. First, Executive Order 12866 directs that each Federal agency shall propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs. Second, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires agencies to analyze the economic effect of regulatory changes on small entities. Third, the Trade Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. section 2531-2533) prohibits agencies from setting standards that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. In developing U.S. standards, this Trade Act also requires the consideration of international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis of U.S. standards. And fourth, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires agencies to prepare a written assessment of the costs, benefits, and other effects of proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate likely to result in the expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100 million or more annually (adjusted for inflation).

The FAA has determined that this proposal has minimal costs, and that it is neither "a significant regulatory action" as defined in Executive Order 12866, nor "significant" as defined in DOT's Regulatory Policies and Procedures. Further, this proposed rule