compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been included in this supplemental notice to clarify this long-standing requirement.

Since these changes expand the scope of the originally proposed rule, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to reopen the comment period to provide additional opportunity for public comment.

There are approximately 273 Model 757 series airplanes equipped with Pratt & Whitney engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 237 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The inspections that were previously required by AD 93-16-09, and retained in this supplemental proposal take approximately 8 work hours per fuse pin at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. There are 4 fuse pins per airplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of these inspections on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$455,040, or \$1,920 per airplane, per cycle. However, since the integrity and strength of the new steel fuse pins permit longer inspection intervals, the cost impact for these inspections would actually be lessened because the proposed inspections are not required to be performed as frequently as currently required by AD 93–16–09. The proposed replacement would take

The proposed replacement would take approximately 56 work hours per fuse pin at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. (There are 4 fuse pins per airplane.) Required parts would be provided by the manufacturer at no cost to the operator. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed replacement on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$3,185,280, or \$13,440 per airplane.

The total cost impact figures discussed above are 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, most 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 costbeneficial. When the FAA, as in this proposed AD, makes a finding of an unsafe condition, this means that this 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.

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 removing amendment 39–8666 (58 FR 45044, August 26, 1993), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Boeing: Docket 94–NM–72–AD. Supersedes AD 93–16–09, Amendment 39–8666.

Applicability: Model 757 series airplanes equipped with Pratt & Whitney engines, 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 (f) of this AD 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: Inspections accomplished prior to the effective date of this amendment in accordance with the procedures described in Boeing Service Bulletin 757–54A0019, Revision 4, dated May 27, 1993; Revision 3, dated March 26, 1992; or Revision 2, dated October 11, 1989; are considered acceptable for compliance with the applicable inspection specified in this amendment.

To prevent cracking of the midspar fuse pins, which may lead to separation of the strut and engine from the wing of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes equipped with straight fuse pins, part number (P/N) 311N5067–1: Prior to the accumulation of 3,800 total flight cycles on the straight fuse pin, perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking in the straight fuse pins, in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 757–54A0019, Revision 5, dated March 17, 1994.

30210