

crossflow tube and flight control cables, and correcting incorrect clearance. For certain airplanes, this service bulletin also describes procedures for replacing existing fuel crossflow tubes with new fuel crossflow tubes. This service bulletin also adds certain airplanes to the effectivity listing.

We also have reviewed and approved Bombardier Learjet 60 Service Bulletin SB 60-28-4, Revision 2, dated August 22, 2001. For certain airplanes, this service bulletin describes procedures for replacing existing fuel crossflow tubes with new fuel crossflow tubes, and measuring the clearance between the crossflow tube and flight control cables.

Accomplishment of the actions specified in these service bulletins is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

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 95-14-09 to require a review of maintenance records or an inspection to determine if a fuel crossflow tube having a certain part number is installed; and follow-on/corrective actions, as applicable. Certain actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously, except as discussed below.

Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletins

Operators should note the following differences between the proposed AD and the service bulletins:

- Bombardier Learjet 60 Alert Service Bulletin SB A60-28-3, Revision 2, recommends that the fuel crossflow tube be inspected for bends and evidence of damage (e.g., contact with the flight control cables). It also recommends that the clearance between the fuel crossflow tube and flight control cables be measured to ensure that it is at least 0.150 inch. This proposed AD would not require those inspections because they pertain to the previous airplane design. In lieu of the previously described inspections for bends and evidence of damage, this proposed AD would require a review of the airplane maintenance records or an inspection to determine if a certain part number for the fuel crossflow tube is installed. In addition, the proposed AD would require measurement of the clearance between the fuel crossflow tube and flight control cables to ensure that it is at least 0.35 inch. We have determined that an interval of 25 flight hours (after

the effective date of this proposed AD) for accomplishment of the review of the airplane maintenance records/inspection would address the identified unsafe condition in a timely manner.

- Alert Service Bulletin A60-28-3, Revision 2, also recommends a compliance time of 600 flight hours to replace the fuel crossflow tube, if necessary. This proposed AD would extend the compliance time to require replacement of any fuel crossflow tube not having the correct part number, with a new tube having the correct part number, within 90 days after the proposed inspection. In developing an appropriate compliance time for this proposed AD, we considered not only the manufacturer's recommendation, but the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition, the average utilization of the affected fleet, and the time necessary to perform the inspection. In light of all of these factors, the FAA finds a longer compliance time for completing the proposed actions to be warranted, in that it represents an appropriate interval of time allowable for affected airplanes to continue to operate without compromising safety.

- Bombardier Learjet 60 Service Bulletins SB A60-28-3, Revision 2, and SB 60-28-4, Revision 2, specify that if the correct fuel crossflow tube part number is installed and if the specified minimum clearance does not exist between the fuel crossflow tube and the flight control cables, the manufacturer may be contacted for disposition. This proposed AD would require that correction of any incorrect clearances be accomplished per a method approved by the FAA.

Clarification of Part Number for Installation

Operators should note that, in Bombardier Learjet 60 Alert Service Bulletin SB A60-28-3, Revision 2, the fuel crossflow tube to be installed in the airplane is incorrectly identified as part number (P/N) 6026020-001 in Figure 1, detail D; the correct P/N is 6026020-005. The FAA has been advised that the manufacturer will issue a revision to this alert service bulletin to correct the error.

Changes to the Applicability of the Existing AD

This proposed AD would expand the applicability to include affected airplanes having serial numbers 60-056 through 60-145 inclusive, in addition to serial numbers 60-001 through 60-055 inclusive identified in the existing AD. All of these airplanes are subject to the identified unsafe condition of this AD.

Changes to 14 CFR Part 39/Effect on the Proposed AD

On July 10, 2002, the FAA issued a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs the FAA's airworthiness directive system. The regulation now includes material that relates to altered products, special flight permits, and alternative methods of compliance (AMOC). Because we have now included this material in part 39, only the office authorized to approve AMOCs is identified in each individual AD. Therefore paragraph (d) and Note 1 of AD 95-14-09 have not been included in this proposed AD. Paragraph (c) of AD 95-14-09 has been revised to only identify the office authorized to approve AMOCs, and is identified as paragraph (f) in this proposed AD.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 145 Model 60 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 109 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

It would take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish the review of airplane maintenance records/inspection proposed in this AD action, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$13,080, or \$120 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the current or proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted. The cost impact figures discussed in AD rulemaking actions represent only the time necessary to perform the specific actions actually required by the AD. These figures typically do not include incidental costs, such as the time required to gain access and close up, planning time, or time necessitated by other administrative actions.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would 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. Therefore, it is determined that this proposal would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

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