type design, the proposed AD would require initial and repetitive inspections of certain stage 1 and stage 2 HPT disks using an improved ultrasonic method whenever the disk is exposed during a shop visit. If a subsurface anomaly is found, the disk must be removed from service and replaced with a serviceable part. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the SB described previously.

There are approximately 131 affected disks installed in engines in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 25 engines on aircraft of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. The FAA estimates that the shipping cost per disk to the facility which will inspect the disk and its return will be approximately $250 per disk, that no engines will require an unplanned HPT module disassembly/assembly, that the inspection would take approximately 8 work hours per disk to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Some disks will require multiple inspections during their service life. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $88,000. The manufacturer has advised the FAA that the all costs relative to the inspection will be reimbursed to the operator.

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. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

39.13 [Amended]

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

99–XX–XX Pratt & Whitney: Docket No. 99–NE–06–AD.

Applicability: Pratt & Whitney JT9D–7R4 Series Turbofan Engines, installed on but not limited to Boeing 747, Airbus A300 and Airbus A310 series airplanes.

Note 1: This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each engine 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 engines that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent high pressure turbine (HPT) disk fracture, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the aircraft, accomplish the following:

(a) For engines with a HPT stage 1 or Stage 2 disk installed that has a serial number listed in the Accomplishment Instructions section of PW SB JT9D–7R4–72–553, Revision 1, dated February 17, 1999, perform initial and repetitive ultrasonic inspections in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions section of PW SB JT9D–7R4–72–553, Revision 1, dated February 17, 1999, as follows:

(1) Perform an initial ultrasonic inspection at the next HPT disk piece part accessibility after the effective date of this AD.

(2) Thereafter, perform an ultrasonic inspection at each HPT disk piece part accessibility after the initial inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (a)(1) of this AD.

(3) For the purpose of this AD, piece part accessibility is defined as removal of the blades from the disk.

(b) Remove from service those HPT disks found with a crack indicating a subsurface anomaly and replace with a serviceable part.

(c) For engines that do not have a HPT stage 1 or Stage 2 disk installed that has a serial number listed in the Accomplishment Instructions section of PW SB JT9D–7R4–72–553, Revision 1, dated February 17, 1999, no inspections are required.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Engine Certification Office. Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Engine Certification Office.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Engine Certification Office.

(e) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on May 27, 1999.

David A. Downey,

Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–14128 Filed 6–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–266–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 and 900 Series Airplanes, Falcon 900EX Series Airplanes, and Falcon 2000 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 and 900 series airplanes, Falcon 900EX series airplanes, and Falcon 2000 series airplanes. This proposal would require revising the Airplane Flight Manual to provide the flight crew with certain instructions associated with the onset of stall warning. This proposal also would require repetitive inspections to detect discrepancies of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer, and corrective actions, if necessary. For certain airplanes, this proposal also would require

replacement of the hinge pin assemblies with new, improved parts. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent excessive movement and consequent deformation of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer, which could result in flutter and possible failure of the rear horizontal stabilizer.

DATES: Comments must be received by July 6, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–266–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Dassault Falcon Jet, P.O. Box 2000, South Hackensack, New Jersey 07606. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 98–NM–266–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–266–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 and 900 series airplanes, Falcon 900EX series airplanes, and Falcon 2000 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during a flight test, excessive clearance was found between the hinge bushings and the hinge pin that attaches the rear horizontal stabilizer to the fuselage structure. Investigation revealed that the excessive clearance was caused by deformation of the hinge bushings due to high dynamic (forceful) loads encountered during flight test stall maneuvers. Although the amount of deformation detected did not represent an immediate hazard to the airplane during the flight test, repeated stall conditions could cause the deformation of the hinge bushings to increase. This condition, if not corrected, could result in flutter and possible failure of the rear horizontal stabilizer.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Dassault has issued Airplane Maintenance Manual (AMM) Temporary Revision 704.0/1, dated November 1997 (for Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes); AMM Procedure 55–501, dated March 1998 (for Model Mystere-Falcon 900 series airplanes); AMM Temporary Revision 55–501, dated November 1997 (for Model Falcon 900EX series airplanes); and AMM Procedure 55–501, dated November 1997 (for Model Falcon 2000 series airplanes). These procedures provide instructions for repetitive dimensional inspections to detect discrepancies (damage, deformation, and excessive movement) of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer.

Additionally, Dassault has issued Service Bulletins F50–274 (F50–55–4), F900–203 (F900–55–3), F900EX–37 (F900EX–55–1), and F2000–118 (F2000–55–1); all dated December 17, 1997. These service bulletins describe, among other things, procedures for replacement of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer with new, improved parts.

The DGAC classified these service documents as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directives 97–370–020(B)R1, dated December 17, 1997 (for Models Mystere-Falcon 50 and 900 series airplanes, and Falcon 900EX series airplanes), and 97–369–004(B), dated December 3, 1997 (for Model Falcon 2000 series airplanes), in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

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

FAA's Conclusions

These airplane models are manufactured in France and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require accomplishment of the actions specified in the applicable service documents described previously, except as discussed below.

Differences Between Proposed Rule and Related Service Information

Operators should note that, although the Dassault service bulletins and Dassault airplane maintenance manual procedures recommend that the manufacturer be contacted for disposition of certain repair conditions, this proposal would require the repair of those conditions to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by either the FAA or the DGAC (or its

delegated agent). In light of the type of repair that would be required to address the identified unsafe condition, and in consonance with existing bilateral airworthiness agreements, the FAA has determined that, for this proposed AD, a repair approved by either the FAA or the DGAC would be acceptable for compliance with this proposed AD.

This proposed AD would differ from the parallel French airworthiness directives in that this proposed AD would require performing an initial inspection to detect discrepancies (damage, deformation, and excessive movement) of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer within 300 flight hours or 6 months after the effective date of this AD. The French airworthiness directives require the initial inspection within 6 years, or prior to the accumulation of 3,750 total flight cycles. In developing the appropriate compliance time, the FAA considered the manufacturer's recommendation and the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition. In light of these factors, the FAA finds that an initial inspection within 300 flight hours or 6 months after the effective date of this AD to be warranted, in that it represents an appropriate interval of time allowable for affected airplanes to continue to operate without compromising safety.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 269 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

For all airplanes, it would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) revision, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AFM revision proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $16,140, or $60 per airplane.

Additionally, for all airplanes, it would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the inspection proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $129,120, or $480 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

For 49 airplanes of U.S. registry it would take approximately 10 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed replacement, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $6,000 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the replacement proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $323,400, or $6,600 per airplane.

The 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.

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. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

Dassault Aviation: Docket 98–NM–266–AD.

Applicability: All Model Mystere-Falcon 50 and 900 series airplanes, Falcon 900EX series airplanes, and Falcon 2000 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 request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (h) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent excessive movement and consequent deformation of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer, which could result in flutter and possible failure of the rear horizontal stabilizer, accomplish the following:

Dassault Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) Revision

(a) Within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, revise the Limitations Section of the FAA-approved AFM to include the following statement. This may be accomplished by inserting a copy of this AD into the AFM.

''DO NOT INTENTIONALLY FLY THE AIRPLANE SLOWER THAN INITIAL STALL WARNING ONSET''

Note 2: The AFM revision required by paragraph (a) of this AD also may be accomplished by inserting a copy of the applicable Temporary Change into the applicable AFM, as specified below. When these Temporary Changes have been incorporated into the general revisions of the AFM, the general revisions may be inserted into the AFM, provided that the information contained in the general revisions is identical to that specified in the Temporary Changes.

- For Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes: Dassault Mystere-Falcon 50 AFM Temporary Change No. 46 (DTM813); and Dassault Mystere-Falcon 50 AFM Temporary Change No. 12 (M813EX).
- For Model Mystere-Falcon 900 series airplanes: Dassault Mystere-Falcon 900 AFM Temporary Change No. 69 (DTM20103).
- For Model Falcon 900EX series airplanes: Dassault Falcon 900EX AFM Temporary Change No. 14 (DTM561).
- For Model Falcon 2000 series airplanes: Dassault Falcon 2000 AFM Temporary Change No. 44 (DTM537).

Initial and Repetitive Inspections

(b) Within 300 flight hours or 6 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first: Perform a dimensional inspection to detect discrepancies (damage, deformation, and excessive movement) of the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer in accordance with paragraph (b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(3), or (b)(4) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes: Inspect in accordance with

Dassault Airplane Maintenance Manual, Temporary Revision, 704.0/1, dated November 1997.

(2) For Model Mystere-Falcon 900 series airplanes: Inspect in accordance with Dassault Airplane Maintenance Manual, Procedure 55–501, dated March 1998.

(3) For Model Falcon 900EX series airplanes: Inspect in accordance with Dassault Airplane Maintenance Manual, Temporary Revision, 55–501, dated November 1997.

(4) For Model Falcon 2000 series airplanes: Inspect in accordance with Dassault Airplane Maintenance Manual, Procedure 55–501, dated November 1997.

(c) If any stall event occurs after the effective date of this AD, perform a dimensional inspection as required by paragraph (b) within 300 flight hours or 6 months after the occurance of the stall event, whichever occurs first. For the purposes of this AD, a stall event is considered to be any event as defined by Federal Aviation Administration [14 CFR 25.201(d)].

(d) If no discrepancy is detected during any inspection required by this AD, repeat at 3,750 flight cycles or 6 years, whichever occurs first.

(e) If any discrepancy is detected during any inspection required by this AD, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by either the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate; or the Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC) (or its delegated agent). Thereafter, repeat the inspections at the times specified in paragraph (b) of this AD.

Replacement

(f) For airplanes listed in Dassault Service Bulletins F50–274 (F50–55–4), F900–203 (F900–55–3), F900EX–37 (F900EX–55–1), and F2000–118 (F2000–55–1), all dated December 17, 1997: Replace the hinge pin assemblies of the rear horizontal stabilizer with new, improved parts in accordance with Part 2, paragraph B.(2) of the Accomplishment Instructions of the applicable service bulletin at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (f)(1) and (f)(2) of this AD.

(1) Accomplish the replacement within 6 years since date of manufacture, or prior to the accumulation of 3,750 total flight cycles, whichever occurs first.

(2) Accomplish the replacement within 300 flight hours or 6 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first.

Spares

(g) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install a rear horizontal stabilizer hinge pin having part number MY2033175 on any airplane.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(h) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(i) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directives 97–370–020(B)R1, dated December 17, 1997, and 97–369–004(B), dated December 3, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 26, 1999.

D.L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–14129 Filed 6–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–CE–79–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; American Champion Aircraft Corporation 7, 8, and 11 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This document withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that would have applied to all American Champion Aircraft Corporation (ACAC) 7, 8, and 11 series airplanes, excluding Model 8GCBC airplanes. The proposed AD would have required installing inspection holes on the top and bottom wing surfaces, repetitively inspecting the front and rear wood spars for damage, repairing or replacing any damaged wood spar, and installing inspection covers. Damage is defined as cracks; compression cracks; longitudinal cracks through the bolt holes or nail holes; or loose or missing rib nails. The proposed AD results from a review of the service history of the affected airplanes that incorporate wood wing spars. The review was prompted by in-flight wing structural failures on ACAC Model 8GCBC airplanes, and revealed several incidents where damage was found on the front and rear wood spars on the affected airplanes. The FAA received comments on the NPRM that recommended alternative methods of complying with the proposed AD and recommended combining the proposed AD with the actions of the current AD required for the ACAC Model 8GCBC airplanes. The FAA has determined that the ideas in the above-referenced comments have merit and should be implemented, and is therefore withdrawing the NPRM and proposing these actions in a new AD that would supersede the current AD required for ACAC Model 8GCBC airplanes.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. William Rohder, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, 2300 E. Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018; telephone: (847) 294–7697; facsimile: (847) 294–7834.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Events Leading to This Action

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to all ACAC 7, 8, and 11 series airplanes (excluding the Model 8GCBC airplanes) was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on November 3, 1997 (62 FR 59310). The NPRM proposed to require installing inspection holes on the top and bottom wing surfaces, repetitively inspecting the front and rear wood spars for damage, repairing or replacing any damaged wood spar, and installing surface covers. Accomplishment of the proposed actions as specified in the NPRM would be required as follows:

—Installations: in accordance with ACAC Service Letter 417, Revision A, dated October 2, 1997;

—Inspections: in accordance with ACAC Service Letter 406, dated March 28, 1994; and

—Spar Repair and Replacement, as applicable: in accordance with Advisory Circular (AC) 43.13–1A, Acceptable Methods, Techniques and Practices; or other data that the FAA has approved for spar repair and replacement.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Comment Issue No. 1: Combine the Actions of the Proposed AD With Those of AD 98–05–04

Two commenters recommend that the FAA combine the actions of the proposed AD with those currently required by AD 98–05–04, which applies to the Model 8GCBC airplanes. These commenters feel that this would