agricultural and non-agricultural enterprises, SBA would not assist any part of the business entity that suffered damage if the primary activity of the total entity was agricultural.

SBA reconsidered the statutory language above and re-evaluated its position with respect to the ''primary activity rule'' which it administratively applied. The Act requires SBA to assist ''victims'' of floods and other catastrophes, without regard to the primary activity of a total business entity. If the victim of a flood or other catastrophe is a non-agricultural business venture, SBA should assist that victim regardless of whether such business is a part of a larger business entity whose primary activity is agricultural. Thus, if the total business operation is comprised of a retail store and a ranch, and the retail store is destroyed by a flood, SBA should offer physical disaster assistance to the retail store even if the ranching operation generated more revenue.

Accordingly, SBA promulgates this final rule to continue to permit SBA to provide physical disaster business loan assistance to a non-agricultural business venture within the total business entity if the non-agricultural business has been damaged by a flood or other catastrophe, regardless of the primary activity of the total business entity. The rule also makes clear that the business entity can be a sole proprietorship, corporation, limited liability company, or partnership.

Compliance With Executive Orders 12612, 12778, and 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (15 U.S.C. S601, et seq.), and the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 35)

SBA certifies that this rule is not a significant rule within the meaning of Executive Order 12866; it is not likely to have annual economic effect of $100 million or more, result in a major increase in costs or prices, or have a significant adverse effect on competition or the United States economy. SBA also certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. S601 *et seq.* This rule makes eligible for physical disaster loans only nonagricultural businesses that are part of a business entity that is primarily agricultural and, therefore, does not meet the substantial number of small businesses criterion anticipated by the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

For purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Ch 35), SBA certifies that this final rule contains no new reporting or recordkeeping requirements.

For purposes of Executive Order 12612, SBA certifies that this rule has no federalism implications warranting the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For purposes of Executive Order 12778, SBA certifies that this rule is drafted, to the extent practicable, in accordance with standards set forth in Section 2 of that Order.

An interim final rule was published in the **Federal Register** on July 1, 1997 (62 FR 35337). An open comment period was provided for interested persons to respond to the interim final rule. Since the date of publication of the interim final rule, no comments were received. Accordingly, the interim final rule is adopted without change as final.

List of Subjects in 13 CFR Part 123

Disaster assistance, Loan programs-business, Small businesses.

Accordingly, the interim final rule amending 13 CFR part 123 which was published at 62 FR 35337 on July 1, 1997, is adopted as a final rule without change.

Dated: July 8, 1998.

Aida Alvarez,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98–23658 Filed 9–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–SW–10–AD; Amendment 39–10727; AD 98–18–11]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Schweizer Aircraft Corporation and Hughes Helicopters, Inc. Model 269A, 269A–1, 269B, 269C, 269D, and TH–55A Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to Schweizer Aircraft Corporation and Hughes Helicopters, Inc. Model 269A, 269A–1, 269B, 269C, 269D, and TH–55A helicopters, that requires a visual inspection of the bond line between the main rotor blade abrasion strip (abrasion strip) and the blade for voids, separation, or lifting of the abrasion strip; a visual inspection of the adhesive bead around the perimeter of the abrasion strip for erosion, cracks, or blisters; a tap (ring) test of the abrasion strip for evidence of debonding or hidden corrosion voids; and removal of any blade with an unairworthy abrasion strip and replacement with an airworthy blade. This amendment is prompted by four reports that indicate that debonding and corrosion have occurred on certain blades where the abrasion strip attaches to the blade skin. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent loss of the abrasion strip from the blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 7, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Raymond Reinhardt, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office, Airframe and Propulsion Branch, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581–1200, telephone (516) 256–7532, fax (516) 568–2716.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that is applicable to Schweizer Aircraft Corporation and Hughes Helicopters, Inc. Model 269A, 269A–1, 269B, 269C, 269D, and TH–55A series helicopters was published in the **Federal Register** on October 30, 1996 (61 FR 55937). That action proposed to require, for each blade, a visual inspection of the bond line between the abrasion strip and the blade for voids, separation, or lifting of the abrasion strip; a visual inspection of the adhesive bead around the perimeter of the abrasion strip for erosion, cracks, or blisters; a tap (ring) test of the abrasion strip for evidence of debonding or hidden corrosion voids; and removal of any blade with a defective abrasion strip and replacement with an airworthy blade. If any deterioration of the abrasion strip adhesive bead was discovered, restoration of the bead in accordance with the applicable maintenance manual was proposed. If an abrasion strip void was found or suspected, removing and replacing the blade with an airworthy blade was also proposed.

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

One commenter states that Model 269C–1 helicopters should be included in the Applicability section of the AD, because this model, which was recently type certificated, could be retro-fitted with any of the affected blades listed in the proposed AD. The FAA concurs,

and future rulemaking action will address this issue.

The same commenter states that a terminating action should be added to the AD. The commenter states that if any of the affected blades are subject to an abrasion strip repair, those blades should no longer be subject to the repetitive inspections listed in the AD. The FAA concurs, and a paragraph will be added to the AD to state that, for an affected blade, blade abrasion strip repair is considered a terminating action for the requirements of this AD. A requirement was added to identify repaired blades.

Another commenter states that the abrasion strip inspections called out in the proposed AD are inadequate to detect defective abrasion strips. The FAA does not concur; the specified inspections are adequate to detect defective abrasion strips and these inspections will remain in the AD.

The commenter also states that current abrasion strip materials and abrasion strip bonding methods are inadequate to assure long-term durability. The FAA does not concur; when performed correctly the current abrasion strip materials and abrasion strip bonding methods are adequate and demonstrate an acceptable service life.

Finally, the commenter would like the FAA to re-evaluate current regulations pertaining to abrasion strip technology and revise the regulations to include minimum performance criteria for adhesively bonded abrasion strip assemblies. The FAA does not concur; current regulations have demonstrated an acceptable level of safety for abrasion strip bonding.

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule with the change described previously, as well as with other non-substantive changes. The FAA has determined that these changes will neither increase the economic burden on any operator nor increase the scope of the AD.

The FAA estimates that 100 helicopters of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately one-third of a work hour per helicopter to conduct the initial inspections; approximately one-third of a work hour to conduct the repetitive inspections; approximately 11 work hours to remove and reinstall a blade; and approximately 32 work hours to repair the blade; and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts (replacement abrasion strips) will cost approximately $57 per main rotor abrasion strip (each helicopter has three main rotor blades). Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $135,850 per year for the first year and $133,850 for each year thereafter, assuming one-sixth of the affected blades in the fleet are removed, repaired, and reinstalled each year, and that all affected helicopters are subjected to one repetitive inspection each year.

The regulations adopted herein will 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 final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) 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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Room 663, Fort Worth, Texas 76137.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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 a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

AD 98–18–11 Schweizer Aircraft Corporation and Hughes Helicopters, INC.: Amendment 39–10727. Docket No. 96–SW–10–AD.

Applicability: Model 269A, 269A–1, 269B, and TH–55A helicopters with main rotor blades, part number (P/N) 269A1190–1, serial numbers (S/N) S0001 through S0012 installed; and Model 269C and 269D helicopters with main rotor blades, P/N 269A1185–1, S/N S222, S312, S313, S325 through S327, S339, S341, S343, S346, S347, S349 through S367, S369 through S377, S379 through S391, S393 through S395, S397, S399, S401 through S417, S419 through S424, S426 through S449, S451 through S507, S509 through S513, S516 through S527, S529 through S540, S542, S544 through S560, S562 through S584, S586 through S595, S597 though S611, S620 through S623, S625, S628, S633, S641 through S644, S646, S653, S658, S664, S665, and S667, installed, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each helicopter 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 helicopters 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 (e) 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 (except for the repair of the abrasion strip) remove any helicopter from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent loss of the abrasion strip from a main rotor blade (blade) and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter, accomplish the following:

(a) Within the next 50 hours time-in-service (TIS), or within 90 calendar days after the effective date of this AD, whichever is earlier, or prior to installing an affected replacement blade, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 50 hours TIS from the date of the last inspection or replacement installation:

(1) Visually inspect the adhesive bead around the perimeter of each abrasion strip for erosion, cracks, or blisters.

(2) Visually inspect the bond line between each abrasion strip and each blade skin for voids, separation, or lifting of the abrasion strip.

(3) Inspect each abrasion strip for debonding or hidden corrosion voids using a tap (ring) test as described in the applicable maintenance manual.

(b) If any deterioration of an abrasion strip adhesive bead is discovered, prior to further flight, restore the bead in accordance with the applicable maintenance manual.

(c) If abrasion strip debonding, separation, or a hidden corrosion void is found or suspected, prior to further flight, remove the blade with the defective abrasion strip and replace it with an airworthy blade.

(d) Repair of an affected blade's abrasion strip is considered a terminating action for the requirements of this AD. Identify the repaired blade with a white dot added adjacent to the blade S/N.

(e) 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, New York Aircraft Certification Office, FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through an FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may concur or comment and then send it to the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the New York Aircraft Certification Office.

(f) 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 helicopter to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished, provided the abrasion strip has not started to separate or debond from the main rotor blade.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on October 7, 1998.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on August 21, 1998.

Larry M. Kelly,

Acting Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–23600 Filed 9–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–242–AD; Amendment 39–10730; AD 98–18–14]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757–200 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Boeing Model 757–200 series airplanes. This action requires a one-time detailed visual inspection to detect damage or chafing of certain electrical wire bundles, and to verify adequate clearance exists between the wire bundles and adjacent disconnect bracket; and repair, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by a report indicating that damaged wires caused an electrical short in the electrical panel, which resulted in a shower of sparks from the overhead panel. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent failure of essential electrical systems and a potential fire hazard for passengers and crewmembers, due to damage or chafing of electrical wire bundles.

DATES: Effective September 17, 1998.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before November 2, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–242–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Information pertaining to this amendment may be obtained from or examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Ave, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Forrest Keller, Senior Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2790; fax (425) 227–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA has received a report indicating that damaged wires caused an electrical short in the P11 electrical panel on a Boeing Model 757–200 series airplane after takeoff, which resulted in a shower of sparks from the overhead panel. Subsequently, several erroneous flight deck indications appeared with the display of multiple caution messages by the engine indication and crew alerting system (EICAS). Investigation of the looms behind the P11 electrical panel revealed that certain wires were routed over the top of the disconnect bracket close to the bracket-bonding stud, which caused the wires to chafe through and resulted in an electrical short in the panel. In a fleetwide inspection of 13 other Boeing Model 757–200 series airplanes, damaged wires on three additional airplanes were detected. This condition, if not corrected, could result in failure of essential electrical systems and a potential fire hazard for passengers and crewmembers, due to damage or chafing of electrical wire bundles.

Explanation of the Requirements of the Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design, this AD is being issued to prevent failure of essential electrical systems and a potential fire hazard for passengers and crewmembers, due to damage or chafing of electrical wire bundles. This AD requires a one-time detailed visual inspection to detect damage or chafing of certain electrical wire bundles, and to verify adequate clearance exists between the wire bundles and adjacent disconnect bracket; and repair, if necessary. Accomplishment of the actions described previously is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

Determination of Rule's Effective Date

Since a situation exists that requires the immediate adoption of this regulation, it is found that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on this rule. Interested persons are invited to comment on this 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 under the caption **ADDRESSES.** All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered, and this rule may be amended in light of the comments received. Factual information that supports the commenter's ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the AD action and determining whether additional rulemaking action would be needed.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify the 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 that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this AD will be filed in the Rules Docket.