

airplane. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent chafing and arcing of the parallel feeder cables of the number 2 IDG, which could result in smoke and/or fire in the right aft galley area.

#### **Actions Since Issuance of Previous Rule**

Since the issuance of that AD, the airplane manufacturer has informed the FAA that it inadvertently omitted 43 airplanes from the effectivity listing of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD11-24A157, dated August 10, 2000 (which was referenced in AD 2001-17-08 an appropriate source of service information for accomplishing the required actions) that are subject to the identified unsafe condition and included 24 other airplanes that are not subject to the identified unsafe condition.

#### **Explanation of Relevant Service Information**

We have reviewed and approved Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD11-24A157, Revision 01, dated March 11, 2003, which revises the effectivity of the initial release of the service bulletin by adding 43 additional airplanes and removing 24 other airplanes. The inspection, repositioning, and corrective actions if necessary specified in Revision 01 are essentially identical to those described in initial release of the service bulletin. No more work is necessary on airplanes changed per the initial release of this service bulletin. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin 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 2001-17-08 to require performing a general visual inspection to detect chafing or damage of the parallel power feeder cables of the number 2 IDG; repairing any chafed cable and damaged structure; and repositioning the parallel power feeder cables of the number 2 IDG. The proposed AD also would revise the applicability of the existing AD by adding certain airplanes and removing certain other airplanes. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the applicable service bulletin revision described previously.

#### **Explanation of Change to Applicability**

The applicability of AD 2001-17-08 identified the affected airplanes as "Model MD-11 series airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD11-24A157, dated August 10, 2000." Although Model MD-11F airplanes are not specifically identified by model name in the applicability of that AD, those airplanes are identified by the manufacturer's fuselage numbers in the referenced service bulletin. This proposed AD would identify those model designations as published in the most recent type certificate data sheet for the affected models (*i.e.*, Model MD-11 and -11F airplanes).

#### **Changes to 14 CFR Part 39/Effect on the AD**

On July 10, 2002, we issued a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs our AD system. The regulation now includes material that relates to altered products, special flight permits, and alternative methods of compliance (AMOCs). Because we have now included this material in part 39, for purposes of this proposed AD, it is only necessary to identify the office authorized to approve AMOCs and previously approved AMOCs that are acceptable for compliance with the applicable requirements of this proposed AD. Therefore, Note 1 and paragraph (c) of AD 2001-17-08 are not included in this proposed AD, and paragraph (b) of AD 2001-17-08 has been revised in this proposed AD.

#### **Change to Labor Rate Estimate**

We have reviewed the figures we have used over the past several years to calculate AD costs to operators. To account for various inflationary costs in the airline industry, we find it necessary to increase the labor rate used in these calculations from \$60 per work hour to \$65 per work hour. The cost impact information, below, reflects this increase in the specified hourly labor rate.

#### **Cost Impact**

There are approximately 85 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 15 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

For Group 1 airplanes listed in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD11-24A157, Revision 01, dated March 11, 2003: The actions that are currently required by AD 2001-17-08 take approximately 4 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$65 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost

impact of the currently required actions on these U.S. operators is estimated to be \$260 per airplane.

For Group 2 airplanes listed in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD11-24A157, Revision 01, dated March 11, 2003: The new actions that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 5 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$65 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$673 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on these U.S. operators is estimated to be \$998 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. The manufacturer may cover the cost of replacement parts associated with this proposed AD, subject to warranty conditions. Manufacturer warranty remedies may also be available for labor costs associated with this proposed AD. As a result, the costs attributable to the proposed AD may be less than stated above.

#### **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 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