

### Configuration Designator G Description

One commenter states that the description for configuration designator G in Table 1 of the proposed rule, should be more specific with respect to the Haynes material, and should reference PW4ENG 72-714, dated June 27, 2000; or Revision 1, dated November 8, 2001; or Chromalloy Florida Repair procedure 00CFL-039-0 dated December 27, 2000.

The FAA does not agree. Configuration G engines, listed by serial number, are first run Phase 3 engines produced without Haynes material in the HPC inner case rear hook. Since these engines specifically do not have Haynes material HPC inner case rear hooks, the FAA does not believe it is necessary to list out the PW SBs or Chromalloy Florida Repair procedure. However the wording in the description has been changed for clarification.

### Include Future Revisions of Documents

One commenter requests that the FAA consider the practice of referencing a document with a specified control date, inclusive of future revisions in an effort to eliminate the errors to NPRMs and the need to request AMOCs when the referenced material is subsequently revised.

The FAA does not agree. The FAA cannot incorporate by reference a document before that document has been published. Therefore, since each revision to a SB is considered a separate document for purposes of incorporation by reference, it is not legally possible for the FAA to approve future revisions before they are published. The FAA will continue to use the AMOC process to approve a later revision of an SB or other service documents incorporated by reference in an AD as an AMOC to the original SB.

### Use Compressor Age to Control Ring Case Configuration Incorporation

One commenter feels it would be more appropriate for the AD to control RCC incorporation based on compressor age, as opposed to a specified date based on forecasted aircraft utilization.

The FAA does not agree. The compliance dates within the final rule use the current average airplane and engine utilization rates for the total fleet. If an operator has a utilization rate outside of this average, the operator can use the AMOC process to seek relief. The risk accumulation of the operator's fleet would be evaluated against the risk model predictions of the total fleet.

### Add Terminating Action for Engines Installed on Airbus Fleet

One commenter suggests that this final rule include the incorporation of the RCC rear HPC as terminating action for engines installed on the Airbus fleet.

The FAA does not agree. The FAA is currently evaluating proposals for terminating actions for Airbus and McDonnell Douglas fleets. Once those proposals are found to meet the airworthiness standards for both engines and transport category aircraft, the FAA will incorporate those terminating actions into this AD. The FAA believes, however, that the current rule should be revised now in order to maintain the desired level of safety based on the fleet-wide risk analysis.

### Request to Add PW4062A Model to Applicability

One commenter states that the applicability section of the proposal does not include the PW4062A model engine. Since this engine is currently used on the Boeing 747-400F airplane and is subject to takeoff power losses due to HPC surges, this commenter requests that this model be included in the applicability section.

The FAA does not agree. The PW4062A engine model is intentionally not added to the applicability section of this AD. The amended Type Certificate adding the PW4062A model included as part of the PW4062A design the interim measures applied to other engine models to address this known high power surge issue. Those measures appear in the Limitation Section of Chapter 5 in the PW4062A Engine Manual. The terminating action for PW4062A model engines installed on Boeing aircraft, the installation of a ring case compressor (RCC), will be addressed in a separate AD that applies to the PW4062A model. The FAA will consider adding the PW4062A engine model to this AD in the future once terminating action is developed and approved for the Airbus and McDonnell Douglas fleets.

### Minimum Build Requirements Inadvertently Omitted

One commenter notes that proposed paragraph (m) does not include the minimum build HPT/HPC mismatch requirement, or the incorporation of SB PW4ENG 72-514, both previously mandated for the SCC HPC engines installed on Boeing airplanes. This commenter points out that it is feasible to have a SCC HPC engine enter the shop, have no work done to the HPC, and be returned to a Boeing airplane. This commenter questions whether these omissions were an oversight.

The FAA agrees that these omissions were an oversight. While the HPC/HPT mismatch or SB PW4ENG 72-514 minimum build standard requirements are not required for RCC HPC engines, the FAA intended that these two requirements form part of the minimum build standard for all SCC HPC engines, regardless of whether the engine is installed on Boeing, Airbus or MD-11 airplanes. Therefore, the FAA revised paragraph (m) of the final rule to include these two requirements for the SCC HPC engines installed on the Boeing fleet.

### AD Compliance Considered More Restrictive Than PW SB Compliance

One commenter states that the compliance of proposed paragraph (m), which requires the ring case incorporation when the HPC module is disassembled to a level that separates the HPC rear case assembly from the HPC module at the H flange, is more restrictive than the PW SBs compliance category 6. This commenter requests that paragraph (m) define the compliance to be the same as a PW SB compliance category 6.

The FAA agrees. It was intended that the compliance for paragraph (m) of the AD be equivalent to a PW SB compliance category 6. Therefore, for clarification, the FAA has added the word "fully", to paragraphs (m) and (u) of the final rule, to clarify that a fully separated H flange from the HPC module is the same as PW SB compliance category 6.

### Request for Drawdown Time

One commenter requests that the FAA allow one or two months of drawdown time from the effective date of the AD, for RCC incorporation. The commenter asks that the FAA consider that some operators may not be ready to do the incorporation by the time the AD is in effect.

The FAA does not agree. The final rule will not be effective until 30 days after publication, providing adequate time to prepare to comply with this AD.

### Request for Reduced Test Interval

One commenter asks the FAA to consider as an addition to proposed paragraph (u)(2)(i) to allow two SCC HPC engines on an airplane after January 31, 2007, provided that the Testing-21 interval be reduced in half, to 400 hours-since-last-test. The commenter suggests that the reduced interval can account for an additional SCC HPC engine installation.

The FAA does not agree. Proposing two SCC HPC engines on-wing after January 31, 2007, with a Testing-21