

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 63, No. 237

Thursday, December 10, 1998

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

7 CFR Parts 300 and 301

[Docket No. 96-069-2]

High-Temperature Forced-Air Treatments for Citrus

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are adding new treatments to the Plant Protection and Quarantine Treatment Manual, which is incorporated by reference into the Code of Federal Regulations, for certain citrus. We are adding treatments involving high-temperature forced air for tangerines, oranges (except navel oranges), and grapefruit from Mexico and areas of the United States that are infested with plant pests in the genus *Anastrepha*, which includes *A. ludens*, the Mexican fruit fly. This action provides an additional option for treating these fruits.

DATES: This regulation is effective December 10, 1998. The incorporation by reference of the material described in the rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 10, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ron Campbell, Operations Officer, Port Operations, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 136, Riverdale, MD 20737-1236, (301) 734-6799; or e-mail RonaldCCampbell@usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

To prevent the spread of plant pests into or within the United States, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) restricts the importation and interstate movement of many articles, including fruits. As a condition of movement,

some fruits are required to be treated for plant pests in accordance with title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Plant Protection and Quarantine Treatment Manual (PPQ Treatment Manual) of the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) contains approved treatment schedules and is incorporated by reference into the CFR at 7 CFR 300.1.

Pursuant to 7 CFR 319.56-2x, USDA allows tangerines, oranges, and grapefruit from Mexico to be imported into the United States if treated in accordance with the PPQ Treatment Manual. In addition, because the Mexican fruit fly infests parts of the United States (currently, parts of Texas and California), USDA regulates the interstate movement of certain articles from those areas under the Mexican Fruit Fly Quarantine and Regulations, found at 7 CFR 301.64 through 301.64-10. Acceptable treatments for the regulated articles are listed in § 301.64-10. Treatments for the regulated articles themselves include a cold treatment, fumigation with methyl bromide, and a high-temperature forced-air treatment for grapefruit of a certain size; treatments for the fields or groves in which the regulated articles are grown include a soil drench with diazinon and a malathion bait spray.

On December 30, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 67761-67763, Docket No. 96-069-1) a proposed rule to amend § 301.64-10 and the PPQ Treatment Manual to include the high-temperature forced-air treatments described below for tangerines, oranges (except navel oranges), and grapefruit from Mexico and areas of the United States affected with pests in the genus *Anastrepha*, which includes *A. ludens*, the Mexican fruit fly. We proposed to amend 7 CFR 300.1 to show that the PPQ Treatment Manual had been so changed and to amend § 301.64-10(e) of the Mexican fruit fly regulations to indicate that treatments for movement of domestic grapefruit, oranges (except navel oranges), and tangerines from areas of the United States infested with the Mexican fruit fly are included in the PPQ Treatment Manual. We also proposed to remove from § 301.64-10 paragraphs (a), (d), and (e) the specific requirements for the cold treatment, the methyl bromide treatment, and the high-temperature forced-air treatment.

Because all of these treatments are listed in the PPQ Treatment Manual, there appeared to be no reason for them also to be listed in the CFR. Finally, we proposed to amend 301.64-10(b) to make some minor grammatical and punctuation changes.

The high-temperature forced-air treatments we proposed were developed by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service (ARS) in conjunction with APHIS-PPQ Methods Development. As proposed, the treatments must be administered in sealed, insulated chambers; the air may be heated in the chambers, or hot air may be introduced into the chambers.

Proposed Treatment for Tangerines

The tangerines must be commercial size 125 or smaller. (Commercial size is an index based on the approximate number of fruit that fit into a commercial shipping box [40 lb or 18.14 kg].) Each tangerine must weigh no more than 8.6 oz (245 g).

Place the tangerines in the chamber and seal it. Raise the air temperature in the chamber to 113 °F (45 °C) or higher for 210 minutes. (Treatment time begins when the coldest air temperature sensor reaches 113 °F.) Record the temperature of each sensor at least once every 2 minutes throughout the treatment. Any temperature reading below 113 °F will invalidate the entire treatment. If any low temperature readings occur, repeat (do not simply extend) the treatment.

Proposed Treatment for Oranges (Except Navel Oranges)

The oranges must be commercial size 100 or smaller. Each orange must weigh no more than 16.5 oz (468 g).

Place the oranges in the chamber and seal it. Raise the air temperature in the chamber to 114.8 °F (46 °C) or higher for 250 minutes. (Treatment time begins when the coldest air temperature sensor reaches 114.8 °F.) Record the temperature of each sensor at least once every 2 minutes throughout the treatment. Any temperature reading below 114.8 °F will invalidate the entire treatment. If any low temperature readings occur, repeat (do not simply extend) the treatment.

Proposed Treatment for Grapefruit

The grapefruit must be commercial size 70 or smaller. Each grapefruit must weigh no more than 18.8 oz (532 g).

Place the grapefruit in the chamber and seal it. Raise the air temperature in the chamber to 114.8 °F (46 °C) or higher for 300 minutes. (Treatment time begins when the coldest air temperature sensor reaches 114.8 °F.) Record the temperature of each sensor at least once every 2 minutes throughout the treatment. Any temperature reading below 114.8 °F will invalidate the entire treatment. If any low temperature readings occur, repeat (do not simply extend) the treatment.

Comments

We solicited comments concerning our proposal for 60 days ending March 2, 1998. We received 28 comments by that date. They were from Mexican citrus producers, USDA employees, a State government, and a citrus industry association. The commenters generally supported the adoption of the proposed high-temperature forced-air treatments; several commenters stated that the proposed treatments were an environmentally sound and feasible alternative to methyl bromide treatments. However, some of the commenters suggested changes or clarifications to the proposed treatments. These comments are discussed below.

One commenter had several questions regarding administration of the proposed treatments: (1) Would the location of the temperature probes make any difference to the efficacy of the treatments (i.e., does it matter if the probes are in the air in the open space in the chamber or if they are attached to a fruit in the fruit container)? (2) Fruits cooled at room temperature have an extended treatment effect, whereas fruits that are hydrocooled or cooled in some other manner following treatment do not. Will there be a requirement addressing the cool-down of the fruits following treatment? (3) Would climatic conditions at the packing plant make any difference in the prescribed length of the proposed treatments? (In the commenter's experience, it takes longer during cold and damp conditions for the

internal temperature of fruits treated in high-temperature forced-air or vapor-heat chambers to reach the required final treatment temperature than during hot and dry conditions.) (4) Would it make any difference if the fruits were treated in lugs (fruits arranged in single layers stacked one on top of another) or in bulk bins (fruits compiled in containers that measure about 2'h x 4'l x 4'w)? (5) Would the ratio of air space and fruit volume in a chamber affect the prescribed length and efficacy of the treatment? (6) Would not the monitoring of the treatments be more precise and safer if the protocol prescribed the measurement of the internal temperature of the citrus fruits and duration needed at that temperature to ensure larvae mortality rather than the temperature and time of the air in the chamber?

A comment provided by the ARS researchers who did the research upon which the proposed high-temperature forced-air treatments were based suggested the inclusion of a high-temperature forced-air treatment for navel oranges. The commenters stated that research proving the quarantine security of the treatment for navel oranges was performed shortly after the completion of the research on the treatments for oranges other than navel oranges, tangerines, and grapefruit. The researchers also suggested changes to clarify the prescribed fruit sizes. Finally, the researchers suggested adding information to the proposed treatments about fruit tolerance, i.e., the maximum temperatures to which the fruit could be subjected and still maintain market quality.

After carefully considering the six procedural questions and the suggestions for clarifying and expanding the proposed treatments, we have decided to change the proposed treatment procedures to a single treatment procedure for tangerines, oranges (except navel oranges), and grapefruit. We believe that this procedure will be an effective treatment for these fruits and will better ensure

efficacy and consistency in administration of the high-temperature forced-air treatment. We have reviewed the completed data concerning the inclusion of a high-temperature forced-air treatment for navel oranges provided by ARS and have determined that the treatment would be effective for navel oranges as well. Accordingly, in the near future we will publish a direct final rule to allow its use on navel oranges. We are amending the PPQ Treatment Manual to include the treatment spelled out below. We are also amending 7 CFR 300.1 to show that there has been a revision to the PPQ Treatment Manual. We are also amending § 301.64-10(e) to indicate that grapefruit, oranges (except navel oranges), and tangerines may be treated with high-temperature forced air as specified in the PPQ Treatment Manual.

New Treatment Procedure

The treatment must be administered in sealed, insulated chambers; the air may be heated in the chambers, or hot air may be introduced into the chambers. The number of temperature probes must be approved in advance during the chamber certification procedure.

Place the temperature probes into the centers of the largest fruit in the load. Place the fruit inside the chamber, seal it, and begin the treatment.

The target temperature is 44 °C (111.2 °F). Throughout the treatment, record the fruit center temperatures at least once every 2 minutes. If it takes less than 90 minutes for the fruit to reach the target temperature, the fruit must remain at the target temperature for any additional time needed to reach 90 minutes, plus another 100 minutes. If the fruit takes 90 minutes or more to reach the target temperature, the fruit must remain at the target temperature for an additional 100 minutes only.

Hydrocooling after treatment is optional.

The treatment is for fruit of the following sizes:

Fruit Variety	Standard Pack Count ¹	Container Size (bu)	Maximum Weight (g)	Maximum Diameter (in)
Tangerines	120	4/5	245 (8.6 oz)	Not specified.
Oranges (except navel oranges)	100	1 2/5	468 (16.4 oz)	3 13/16
Grapefruit	70	1 2/5	536 (18.8 oz)	4 5/16

¹ Standard pack count is an index based on the approximate number of fruit of uniform diameter that fit into a bushel container of the size indicated.

Examples of Treatment Administration

1. If the center temperature of fruit located in the coolest location inside a forced-air chamber required 112 minutes to reach 44 °C, then the total treatment time for the fruit load would be 212 minutes (112 minutes approach time to target temperature + 100 minutes treatment time at target temperature).

2. If the center temperature of fruit located in the coolest location inside a forced-air chamber required 80 minutes to reach 44 °C, then the total treatment time for the fruit load would be 190 minutes (80 minutes approach time to target temperature + 10 additional minutes so that approach time is the required 90 minutes in duration + 100 minutes treatment time at target temperature).

Note: Tolerance data may be obtained from the USDA-ARS Subtropical Research Center, Crop Quality & Fruit Insects, 2301 S. International Blvd., Weslaco, TX 78596, or the USDA-APHIS-PPQ Oxford Plant Protection Center, 901 Hillsboro Street, Oxford, NC 27565.

We developed the changes in treatment procedure in consultation with the ARS researchers who performed the research upon which the proposed procedures were based. The new procedure is based upon the same research. As discussed below, we and ARS believe the modifications address the comments concerning placement of the temperature probes, measurement of internal fruit temperature, fruit cool-down following treatment, variable climatic conditions at the treatment facilities, arrangement of the fruit during treatment, and ratio of air space and fruit volume in the treatment chamber.

We agree that placing the temperature probes in the centers of the largest fruit in the load to measure the internal temperatures of the fruit instead of placing the temperature probes in the open space of the chamber to measure the air temperature in the chamber is a better method of monitoring the treatment to ensure larvae mortality. Variable climatic conditions at the treatment facilities (which could cause differences in the amount of time needed for fruit centers to reach the target temperature) are of no consequence now because the new procedure allows for a variable approach time to the target temperature but requires a minimum approach time of 90 minutes. Fruit cool-down is irrelevant under the new procedure because treating the fruit at the temperature and for the time prescribed ensures larvae mortality, so any extended treatment effect resulting from

cooling the fruit at room temperature would be unnecessary. Fruit placement in the treatment chamber and the ratio of air space and fruit volume does not matter because, by measuring the center temperatures of the largest fruit in the load as required in the new procedure, treatment administrators will know that the fruit in the load has been raised to the target temperature. (Using the procedure specified in the proposed rule, treatment administrators might not know whether fruit in the center of a bulk bin had reached the required temperature because the proposed treatments called for measuring the temperature of the air in the chamber.)

The new procedure better describes the required sizes of the fruit undergoing treatment, as requested by the ARS researchers who did the research on the high-temperature forced-air treatments. We are not including the fruit tolerance information suggested by the researchers because the data submitted was for fruit of different sizes than those specified in this rule. However, we have provided two sources that treatment administrators may consult for information on fruit tolerance. We are also not allowing the treatment to be used for navel oranges at this time. However, as stated previously, we have reviewed the data provided by the ARS researchers and have determined that the treatment would be effective for use on navel oranges. In the near future, we will publish a direct final rule to allow the treatment to be used on navel oranges.

One commenter expressed concern that, by removing from the CFR certain treatments that are also listed in the PPQ Treatment Manual, we might gain flexibility by eliminating the need to publish treatment changes in the **Federal Register**, but the result would be less industry input.

This commenter has misunderstood the effect of incorporation by reference. Because the PPQ Treatment Manual is incorporated by reference into the CFR, any changes made to the Manual must be made in accordance with the procedures for making changes to the CFR. Therefore, before we make any changes to the treatments listed in either the PPQ Treatment Manual or in title 7 of the CFR, we must publish the changes as a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** for public comment.

We are making the proposed nonsubstantive changes to paragraphs (a) and (e) of § 301.64-10 to avoid redundancies with the PPQ Treatment Manual. We are also making some nonsubstantive changes to paragraphs (b) and (c) of § 301.64-10 to correct some punctuation and formatting errors.

Therefore, for the reasons given in the proposed rule and in this document, we are adopting the proposed rule as a final rule, with the changes discussed in this document.

Effective Date

This is a substantive rule that relieves restrictions and, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, may be made effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Immediate implementation of this rule is necessary to provide relief to those persons who are adversely affected by restrictions we no longer find warranted. The shipping season for citrus from Mexico, Texas, and California is under way. Making this rule effective immediately will allow interested producers and others in the marketing chain to benefit during this year's shipping season. Therefore, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this rule should be effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review process required by Executive Order 12866.

This rule, which allows the use of a process involving high-temperature forced air for treating tangerines, oranges (except navel oranges), and grapefruit from areas of Mexico and the United States infested with plant pests of the genus *Anastrepha* (which includes *A. ludens*, the Mexican fruit fly), could affect producers and treatment administrators in areas in Texas and California regulated for the Mexican fruit fly and U.S. citrus imports from Mexico.

Regulated areas in Texas comprise a major citrus-growing region of the United States. Four of the five regulated production areas in Texas were infested in fiscal year (FY) 1996 and FY 1997. Methyl bromide fumigation is the method used to treat fruit for export and for shipment to other U.S. citrus-growing areas, although other treatments (including an existing high-temperature forced-air alternative for grapefruit) and a bait-spray program are options available to producers. More than 90 percent of the fruit treated are grapefruit; the rest are oranges. In FY 1996, 5.4 million pounds of citrus from regulated areas of Texas were fumigated, and this amount increased to 19.2 million pounds in FY 1997. Ninety

percent of the treated fruit is shipped to California, and 10 percent, to Mexico.

Eight fumigation companies treat citrus shipped from the regulated areas of Texas. The fumigation facilities are located in the packing sheds of major packing houses. Some are private companies; others operate as cooperatives. All of the fumigation companies can be considered small entities by Small Business Administration standards (annual revenue less than \$5 million, averaged over 3 years).

The use of high-temperature forced air as an alternative treatment could lead to a reduction in revenue for the fumigation companies, if the new treatment is found by the growers to be financially preferable. At growers' meetings in the area, the possibility of building and operating one or two high-temperature forced-air treatment facilities as cooperative ventures has been discussed. However, the consensus has been that more information is needed before the sizable expenditures such facilities would require are made. Major doubts remain in the minds of producers concerning the speed with which the fruit could be treated and the risk of fruit being damaged by the high temperatures. Producers are unlikely to replace fumigation with the proposed high-temperature forced-air process until these issues are resolved to their satisfaction.

The area in California currently infested with the Mexican fruit fly is in San Diego County. Avocados are the major crop in the regulated area. Because this outbreak occurred recently, there is little history of treatment for movement of restricted articles from the area.

Mexico is a major supplier of oranges to the United States, providing one-third or more of all oranges imported. Tangerine imports from Mexico are less significant, while grapefruit shipments from Mexico have been minor or nonexistent. In 1996, Mexico exported 7,633 metric tons of oranges (worth about \$3.7 million), 2,596 metric tons of tangerines (\$1.2 million), and 109 metric tons of grapefruit (\$88,000) to the United States; the combined import value of the three fruits was about \$5 million. In 1997, Mexico exported 10,461 metric tons of oranges (\$4.9 million), 4,198 metric tons of tangerines (\$1.6 million), and no grapefruit to the United States; the combined import value was about \$6.5 million. This pattern has continued in the 1998 export season, with about 9,100 metric tons of oranges and about 3,100 metric tons of tangerines entering the United States from Mexico.

Citrus imports from Mexico that originate in certain areas of the State of Sonora considered to be free of the Mexican fruit fly require only certification. Citrus imports from the rest of Mexico are treated for *Anastrepha* species using methyl bromide fumigation. Outside the designated areas in Sonora, tangerines are the most commonly exported fruit to the United States because they are not as susceptible to damage from methyl bromide fumigation as are oranges. Conversely, only oranges are exported to the United States from the designated areas of Sonora.

The use of high-temperature forced air as an alternative treatment will provide an incentive for citrus producers outside of Sonora to broaden their citrus exports to the United States to include oranges because the phytotoxicity of oranges to methyl bromide will no longer be an issue. A facility capable of treating citrus with high-temperature forced air has been built in Mexico. Its use is expected to widen the citrus export season for producers outside of Sonora: The export season for tangerines from Mexico is from November to February; the export season for all citrus from Mexico is from October to May or June.

Citrus producers in the regulated areas in Texas are expected to monitor the experiences of Mexican producers with the new treatment and reassess its future adoption. Effects of this rule on fumigation companies in the regulated areas of Texas (and on any fumigation companies that may serve producers in the newly regulated area in California) are expected to be negligible to nonexistent. The proposed treatment will provide another alternative for producers and fumigation companies.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12372

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

Executive Order 12988

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings

before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects

7 CFR Part 300

Incorporation by reference, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine.

7 CFR Part 301

Agricultural commodities, Incorporation by reference, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

Accordingly, we are amending 7 CFR parts 300 and 301 as follows:

PART 300—INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

1. The authority citation for part 300 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 150ee, 154, 161, 162, and 167; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(c).

2. In § 300.1, the section heading and paragraph (a) introductory text are revised to read as follow:

§ 300.1 Materials incorporated by reference.

(a) *Plant Protection and Quarantine Treatment Manual.* The Plant Protection and Quarantine Treatment Manual, which was reprinted November 30, 1992, and includes all revisions through January 1, 1999 has been approved for incorporation by reference in 7 CFR chapter III by the Director of the Office of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

* * * * *

PART 301—DOMESTIC QUARANTINE NOTICES

3. The authority citation for part 301 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 147a, 150bb, 150dd, 150ee, 150ff, 161, 162, and 164–167; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(c).

4. Section 301.64–10 is revised to read as follows:

§ 301.64–10 Treatments.

Treatments for regulated articles must be one of the following:

(a) *Apple, grapefruit, orange, pear, plum, pomegranate, quince, and tangerine.* Cold treatment in accordance with the PPQ Treatment Manual. For the full identification of this standard,

see § 300.1 of this chapter, "Materials incorporated by reference".

(b) *Soil within the dripline of plants that are producing or that have produced fruits listed in § 301.64-2(a).* Remove host fruits from host plants prior to treatment. Using ground equipment, drench the soil under the host plants with 5 lb a.i. diazinon per acre (0.12 lb or 2 oz avdp per 1,000 ft²) mixed with 130 gal of water per acre (3 gal per 1,000 ft²). Apply at 14- to 16-day intervals as needed. Repeat applications if infestations become established. In addition to the above, follow all label directions for diazinon.

(c) *Premises.* A field, grove, or area that is located within the quarantined area but outside the infested core area, and that produces regulated articles, must receive regular treatments with malathion bait spray. These treatments must take place at 6- to 10-day intervals, starting a sufficient time before harvest (but not less than 30 days before harvest) to allow for completion of egg and larvae development of the Mexican fruit fly. Determination of the time period must be based on the day degrees model for Mexican fruit fly. Once treatment has begun, it must continue through the harvest period. The malathion bait spray treatment must be applied by aircraft or ground equipment at a rate of 2.4 oz of technical grade malathion and 9.6 oz of protein hydrolysate per acre.

(d) *Grapefruit and oranges.* Methyl bromide in accordance with the PPQ Treatment Manual.

(e) *Grapefruit, oranges (except navel oranges), and tangerines.* High-temperature forced air in accordance with the PPQ Treatment Manual.

Done in Washington, DC, this 2nd day of December 1998.

Joan M. Arnoldi,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 98-32589 Filed 12-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98-NM-263-AD; Amendment 39-10930; AD 98-13-12 R1]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737, 747, 757, 767, and 777 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment revises an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 737, 747, 757, 767, and 777 series airplanes, that currently requires a one-time inspection to detect discrepancies of the fasteners that connect the pushrods to the rudder pedal assemblies; and corrective actions, if necessary. That AD was prompted by reports of loose and missing fasteners due to incorrect installation. The actions specified by that AD are intended to prevent loss of rudder control, jamming of the rudder system, uncommanded movement of the rudder system, and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane, due to loose or missing fasteners that connect the pushrods to the rudder pedal assemblies. This amendment clarifies certain procedures for the required inspection and expands the applicability to include additional airplanes, which are not currently on the U.S. Register.

DATES: Effective December 28, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations, is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 28, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain other publications was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register as of July 6, 1998 (63 FR 33246, June 18, 1998).

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before February 8, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-263-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124-2207. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R.C. Jones, Aerospace 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) 227-1118; fax (425) 227-1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 11, 1998, the FAA issued AD 98-13-12, amendment 39-10600 (63 FR 33246, June 18, 1998), applicable to certain Boeing Model 737, 747, 757, 767, and 777 series airplanes. That AD requires a one-time inspection to detect discrepancies of the fasteners that connect the pushrods to the rudder pedal assemblies; and corrective actions, if necessary. That action was prompted by reports of loose and missing fasteners due to incorrect installation. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent loss of rudder control, jamming of the rudder system, uncommanded movement of the rudder system, and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane, due to loose or missing fasteners that connect the pushrods to the rudder pedal assemblies.

Actions Since Issuance of the AD

Since the issuance of that AD, the FAA has become aware that paragraph (a) of the rule misidentifies the area to be inspected. Currently, that AD specifies that operators are to inspect the fasteners that connect the "forward" ends of the pushrods to the rudder pedal assemblies. However, the FAA intended to omit any reference to either the forward ends or the rear ends of the pushrods. (For certain models, the forward end of the pushrod is the subject inspection area; for other models, the rear end of the pushrod is the subject inspection area.) Therefore, the FAA has revised paragraph (a) of the rule to identify "the ends" of the pushrods as the appropriate area for the required inspection.

New Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747-27A2368, Revision 1, dated May 7, 1998, and Revision 2, dated May 28, 1998 (for Boeing Model 747 series airplanes). Revision 1 adds part numbers and respective torque value specifications for the nuts for the rudder pedal pushrods; these specifications had been inadvertently omitted from the original version of that alert service bulletin. Revision 2 identifies three Model 747 series airplanes that had been incorrectly omitted from the effectivity listing in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747-27A2368, dated March 26, 1998 (which is cited in the existing AD as the appropriate source of service information for affected Model 747 series airplanes). The inspection procedures described in Revisions 1 and 2 are identical to those described in the original version of the alert service bulletin. The only change made by