



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

FLIGHT STANDARDS DISTRICT OFFICE  
One Airport Way, Suite 110  
Rochester, New York 14624

March 5, 1993

Mr. [REDACTED]  
P.M. Research, Inc.  
4110 Niles Hill Road  
Wellsville, NY 14895

Dear Mr. [REDACTED]:

This letter is in response to your March 6, 1992 and December 1, 1992 letters requesting written confirmation of our verbal opinion of some six years ago. That opinion was that your erosion protection tape products should be considered as paint or tape since they are in reality tape whether two dimensional or formed into a three dimensional shape. Since your products are not structural in nature but more of a cosmetic nature and are of the nature of paint and tape, no FAA approval was necessary.

The information you sent to me was forwarded to the New York Aircraft Certification Office for their review and opinion. They have found that the data provided on the nature of the products, the specification of the products, the installation of the products, the radar transmissivity test data done by Norton Company, and the history of the products, is acceptable from an engineering standpoint in reference to the request of your December 1, 1992 letter.

Therefore, I can confirm our earlier opinion and authorize the use of the P.M. Research, Inc. line of Erosion Protection Masks (Boots) on type certificated aircraft. Since the installation of the P.M. Research, Inc. mask is similar to applying a thick coat of paint and since the Norton transmission test data shows a minimum of loss in transmission efficiency when installed on a radome, the P.M. Research, Inc. line of Erosion Protection Masks can be installed and the aircraft returned to service in the same manner as if it was just painted.

Sincerely,

Gordon H. Fellows  
Principal Maintenance Inspector

RECEIVED  
MAR 06 1993

P. M. RESEARCH INC.