

have not been maintained in accordance with the proposed requirements of this AD action, the first basic task in each aircraft area to be performed by the new operator would be required to be performed before the airplane is placed in service, or in accordance with a schedule approved by the FAA.

With regard to the requirements of paragraph (f), the FAA considers it essential that operators ensure that transferred airplanes are inspected in accordance with the baseline corrosion prevention and control program on the same basis as if there were continuity in ownership. Scheduling of the inspections for each airplane must not be delayed or postponed due to a transfer of ownership. The proposed rule would require that the specified procedures be accomplished before any operator places into service any airplane subject to the requirements of the proposed AD.

Paragraph (g) of the proposal would require that reports of Level 2 and Level 3 corrosion be submitted to Mitsubishi within certain time periods after such corrosion is detected. A note has been included in this paragraph indicating that reporting to the FAA of any Level 2 or Level 3 corrosion found as a result of any opportunity inspections is highly desirable. Operators are not relieved, however, from reporting corrosion findings as required by FAR § 121.703.

### Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 39 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 8 work hours per basic task to accomplish the 30 basic tasks called out in the Document; this represents a total average of 240 work hours (this figure includes not only inspection time, but access and closure time as well).

The average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators for the 4-year average inspection cycle is estimated to be \$561,600, or \$14,400 per airplane.

The total cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The FAA recognizes that the obligation to maintain aircraft in an airworthy condition is vital, but sometimes expensive. Because AD's require specific actions to address specific unsafe conditions, they appear to impose costs that would not otherwise be borne by operators.

However, because of the general obligation of operators to maintain aircraft in an airworthy condition, this appearance is deceptive. Attributing those costs solely to the issuance of this AD is unrealistic because, in the interest of maintaining safe aircraft, prudent operators would accomplish the required actions even if they were not required to do so by the AD.

A full cost-benefit analysis has not been accomplished for this proposed AD. As a matter of law, in order to be airworthy, an aircraft must conform to its type design and be in a condition for safe operation. The type design is approved only after the FAA makes a determination that it complies with all applicable airworthiness requirements. In adopting and maintaining those requirements, the FAA has already made the determination that they establish a level of safety that is cost-beneficial. When the FAA, as in this proposed AD, makes a finding of an unsafe condition, this means that the original cost-beneficial level of safety is no longer being achieved and that the proposed actions are necessary to restore that level of safety. Because this level of safety has already been determined to be cost-beneficial, a full cost-benefit analysis for this proposed AD would be redundant and unnecessary.

### Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects 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, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

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 location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

### The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

### PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

#### § 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

**Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.:** Docket 94-NM-167-AD.

**Applicability:** All Model YS-11 and -11A series airplanes, certificated in any category.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (h) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

**Compliance:** Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

**Note 2:** This AD references MHI Publication No. YS-MR-301, "YS-11 Corrosion Control Program," dated November 1, 1993 (hereafter referred to as "the Document"), for basic tasks, definitions of corrosion levels, compliance times, and reporting requirements. In addition, this AD specifies inspection and reporting requirements beyond those included in the Document. Where there are differences between the AD and the Document, the AD prevails.

**Note 3:** As used throughout this AD, the term "the FAA" is defined differently for different operators, as follows: For those operators complying with paragraph (a) of this AD, "the FAA" is defined as "the Manager of the Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO)." For those operators operating under Federal Aviation