In light of this, since the FAA is aware that the outflow/safety valves having the particular part numbers specified in this AD are installed only on the Learjet airplanes identified in the applicability of this AD, the FAA finds it appropriate in this case to issue the AD against the airplane. The FAA may consider addressing outflow/safety valves having other part numbers in subsequent rulemaking actions, applicable to the airplanes on which the valves are

The commenter also requests that certain Learjet service bulletins and the address for obtaining those service bulletins be cited in lieu of the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins cited in the proposal. The commenter indicates that Allied Signal Aerospace does not mail their service bulletins to operators of Learjet airplanes. The commenter also points out that the Learjet service bulletins transmit the same Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins referenced in the AD. The commenter also indicates that the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins do not describe procedures for replacement of certain outflow/safety valves; therefore, the commenter has submitted a suggested rewrite of the service bulletin description that appeared in the preamble of the proposed rule. Learjet contends that its service bulletins more accurately define the serial numbers of the airplanes on which suspect valves may be installed, and includes those serial numbers in a suggested rewrite of the applicability of the AD. Finally, the commenter adds that the Learjet service bulletins were approved by the FAA as an alternative method of compliance with AD 94-26-01.

The FAA concurs partially. In AD 94– 26–01, the FAA cited the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins as the appropriate sources of service information; those citations were appropriately carried over into this AD. As explained in the preamble to the proposal, the FAA also reviewed and approved the Learjet service bulletins discussed by the commenter. While the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins do not contain specific procedures for replacement of the outflow/safety valves, those service bulletins do refer operators to the "airplane manufacturer's instructions" for the replacement procedures. Therefore, the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins are considered appropriate sources of service information for accomplishing the replacement.

In light of the commenter's remarks, however, the FAA has determined that the actions required by this AD may be accomplished in accordance with the procedures described in the Learjet service bulletins as well as the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins. Therefore, the final rule has been revised to reference both service information sources. In addition, the address for obtaining the Learjet service bulletins also has been added to the Addresses section of the preamble to this final rule. Further, the FAA has included in the applicability of this AD references to the Learjet service bulletins as sources for identification of airplane serial numbers on which suspect valves may be installed. (The applicability of the AD continues to reference the Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins as the appropriate sources for identification of the affected outflow/safety valves.)

Learjet asks that the product identification statement (after the heading "Airworthiness Directives" at the beginning of the preamble to the rule) be reworded from "Learjet Model 24, 25, 31, 35, 36, and 55 Series Airplanes, and Learjet Model 28 and 29 Airplanes" to "Certain Learjet Model 24, 25, 31, 35, and 36 and All Model 28, 29, and 55 Series Airplanes." Learjet suggests that similar wording should appear throughout the rule. The FAA concurs partially. The product identification statement at the beginning of the preamble of an AD simply denotes the name of the type certificate holder or product manufacturer and the model designations of the affected airplanes. The FAA does not generally include the words "certain" or "all" in that statement; it is kept to a minimal length. However, the preamble of the final rule has been revised to include the commenter's suggested change. Further, the FAA infers from Learjet's request that its airplanes should be designated as "series" airplanes; therefore, the final rule has been revised accordingly.

Learjet also requests that the statement of unsafe condition that relates to AD 94-26-01, which appeared in the Summary section of the preamble of the proposed rule, be revised. The proposed rule indicates that the actions specified by AD 94-26-01 are intended to "prevent cracking and subsequent failure of the outflow/safety valves, which could result in rapid decompression of the airplane." The commenter suggests that the actions specified by that AD are intended to "limit the airplane operating altitude due to a possible failure of the outflow/ safety valves, which could result in rapid decompression of the airplane." The FAA concurs with the commenter's

request, and has revised the wording throughout the final rule accordingly

Learjet also requests clarification of a paragraph that appeared in the preamble of the proposal that explains "Note 1" of the AD. That Note discusses the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. Learjet asks if this paragraph addresses aircraft that no longer meet

the original type design.

Although every effort was made to keep the language simple and clear in the paragraph referenced by the commenter, the FAA finds it apparent that some additional explanation is necessary to clarify for this commenter its intent. The paragraph referenced by the commenter merely explains the reason for the FAA's decision to include Note 1 in this AD. It does not change the substance of either the Note or of the regulatory effect of an AD, which the note is intended to explain. In response to the specific question posed by the commenter, in a literal sense, airplanes that have been altered "no longer meet the original type design." However, as the Note states, that fact is irrelevant to the question of whether any airplane is subject to the AD; the applicability statement of the AD stands on its own.

Learjet also requests that the economic impact information presented in the preamble to the proposal be revised to reflect the most current data available with regard to number of affected airplanes. Learjet indicates that there are approximately 1,333 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet, and that 840 of those airplanes are on the U.S. Register. Learjet also suggests that the AD reflect an estimate of 3 work hours that will be necessary for operators to inspect the outflow/ safety valves installed on its airplanes. The commenter also suggests that proposed paragraph (b) be rewritten to include a requirement to inspect the outflow/safety valves to determine their part number.

The FAA concurs partially. The FAA has revised the total number of airplanes affected by this AD, as suggested by the commenter. However, the FAA does not find it necessary to include an additional requirement for an inspection to determine the part number of the outflow/safety valves, since the applicability of the AD indicates that it applies only to those airplanes having outflow/safety valves that are identified in certain Allied Signal Aerospace service bulletins. The FAA acknowledges that it will be necessary for an operator to determine if this AD applies to its fleet, and has