

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.

Incorporation by Reference

(e) The inspections and modification shall be done in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A330-53-3020, dated November 30, 1995; Airbus Service Bulletin A340-53-4029, dated November 30, 1995; Airbus Service Bulletin A330-53-3019, dated November 30, 1995; and Airbus Service Bulletin A340-53-4028, dated November 30, 1995; as applicable. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directives 96-056-029 (B) and 96-057-042 (B); each dated March 13, 1996.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on December 17, 1999.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 3, 1999.

D.L. Riggins,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99-29327 Filed 11-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97-NM-227-AD; Amendment 39-11409; AD 99-23-13]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727-200 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all Boeing Model 727-200 series airplanes, that requires repetitive inspections to detect cracks in certain areas between the upper and lower sills of the number 1 cargo door, and repair, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by reports indicating that fatigue cracks were found in certain structures adjacent to the number 1 cargo door cutout at the forward and aft doorway frames. The actions specified by this AD are intended to detect and

correct such fatigue cracking, which could result in rapid decompression of the fuselage and consequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

DATES: Effective December 17, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 17, 1999.

ADDRESSES: 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:

Walter Sippel, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-2774; fax (425) 227-1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Boeing Model 727-200 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on July 15, 1998 (63 FR 38123). That action proposed to require repetitive inspections to detect cracks in certain areas between the upper and lower sills of the number 1 cargo door, and repair, if necessary.

Explanation of Changes Made to the Proposal

The FAA has revised this final rule to clarify the inspection requirement contained in the proposed AD. Whereas the proposal specified a close visual inspection, as recommended in Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997, the FAA has revised this final rule to clarify that its intent is to require a detailed visual inspection. Additionally, a note has been added to the final rule to define that inspection.

In addition, in the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), the FAA stated that this AD is considered interim action until final action is identified, at which time the FAA may consider further rulemaking. Since the issuance of the NPRM, the FAA has determined that no further action is required at this time. No modification to address the unsafe condition is currently available, and the FAA finds that the inspections required

by this AD are adequate for continued safe operation.

Also, throughout the proposed rule, the FAA referred to Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, as an "alert" service bulletin. The reference to this service bulletin as an alert is erroneous. The original issue of the service bulletin is considered an alert service bulletin; however, the FAA does not consider Revision 1 an alert. Therefore, this final rule refers to Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, as "the service bulletin."

Comments

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

Support for the Proposal

One commenter supports the proposed rule.

Request to Allow Inspection of Each Frame Separately

One commenter states that it does not agree that a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection of both forward and aft frames should be required within 3,000 flight cycles if a repair has only been accomplished on one frame or the other. The commenter makes no specific request; however, the FAA infers that the commenter is requesting to be allowed to inspect forward and aft frames at separate intervals, if only one of the frames has been repaired.

The FAA concurs with the commenter's request. There is no technical reason to require inspections of repaired and non-repaired frames at the same time. Therefore, the FAA has determined that it would be more appropriate to allow inspection of the forward or aft frame at the threshold corresponding to its configuration repaired or non-repaired rather than requiring that forward and aft frames both be inspected at the threshold for repaired structure if repair has been accomplished on one or the other. As proposed, paragraph (c) of this AD already allows for repeat inspections of repaired structure to be accomplished separately, at a different interval than non-repaired structure. Therefore, only paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) of the final rule have been revised accordingly.

Request to Include Instructions for Inspection

One commenter requests that either the service bulletin or the proposed AD be revised to include instructions for the inspections to be performed at 3,000 flight cycles. The commenter states that

the service bulletin includes accomplishment instructions only for the inspections to be performed at 15,000 flight cycles.

The FAA partially concurs with the commenter's request. The FAA notes that the access requirements and instructions for the repetitive detailed visual inspections of the frame web are the same at both 3,000 and 15,000 flight cycles. (However, at the repetitive interval of 15,000 flight cycles, an HFEC inspection is also required.) The instructions for the detailed visual inspection (which, as stated previously, is identified in the service bulletin as a close visual inspection) and HFEC inspections are defined in the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin, which references Figures 1, 2, and 3 for additional instructions. The FAA finds that clarification of the source of the access requirements and instructions for the detailed visual inspection is necessary. Therefore, paragraph (a) of this final rule has been revised to specify that the inspections are to be accomplished in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin.

Request to Revise Threshold for Initial Inspection of Repaired Airplanes

One commenter requests that paragraphs (a)(2) and (a)(3) of the proposed rule be revised to increase the threshold, for the initial inspection of airplanes on which repairs have been accomplished previously, from 3,000 to 30,000 flight cycles. The commenter substantiates its request by stating that cracking has not been detected on repaired structure on any airplane in its fleet.

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request. The FAA has determined that repairs accomplished previously on the affected airplanes may not be adequate to ensure the safety of the airplane fleet. As explained in the Discussion section of the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), cracking of repaired structure has been detected on several airplanes. In one case, cracking of repaired structure was detected prior to the accumulation of 3,000 flight cycles after the repair. Based on these data, the FAA has determined that 3,000 flight cycles represents an appropriate interval for affected airplanes to continue to operate safely. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request for Justification of Inspection Threshold

One commenter requests that the FAA provide justification for the inspection threshold stated in paragraph (a)(2) of

the proposed rule. The commenter states that paragraph (a)(2) requires an inspection within 3,000 flight cycles after repair, and remarks that, "It does not seem logical to require HFEC within 3,000 cycles from repair and then repeat at 15,000 cycle intervals." The commenter requests that paragraph (a)(2) be revised to require repetitive inspections at 3,000 flight cycle intervals and HFEC inspections at 15,000 flight cycles.

The FAA does not concur. The FAA finds that the commenter misunderstands the inspection threshold stated in paragraph (a)(2) of the proposed rule. That paragraph requires that airplanes on which a repair in accordance with the service bulletin has been accomplished be inspected within 3,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, not after the installation of the repair, as the commenter suggests. As discussed previously, the FAA has determined that repairs accomplished previously on the affected airplanes may not be adequate to ensure the safety of the airplane fleet. The FAA finds that a compliance time of 3,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD will provide operators with enough time to inspect repaired structure while still ensuring that any cracks are detected in a timely manner. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request to Remove Requirements for FAA Approval of Repairs and Inspections

Two commenters request that the inspection methods and intervals for repaired airplanes be the same as those specified in the service bulletin for non-repaired airplanes. Along with this, the commenters request the removal of the requirement to obtain FAA-approval of certain repairs and repetitive inspections from paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(2), and (c)(2) of the proposed AD. The commenters contend that it would be cost prohibitive to survey and evaluate their entire fleets for previous repairs, and to coordinate repair and inspection methods and intervals with Boeing and the FAA. One of the commenters further states that it is impractical to require operators to develop special inspection methods for each repair, and that inspection criteria for any repair should be defined in the service bulletin or proposed AD, and should be generic enough to apply to any repair that might exist in the area. One of the commenters also states that the requirements for approval of inspections and methods proposed in the NPRM were not mentioned in the service bulletin.

The FAA does not concur with the commenters' request. As discussed previously, the FAA has determined that repairs accomplished previously on the affected airplanes may not be adequate to ensure the safety of the fleet of airplanes. As stated in the Discussion section of the NPRM, at least one incident has been reported in which a previously repaired aft frame web and frame inner chord were found completely severed. Therefore, the FAA finds that the affected airplanes, including those on which repairs have been accomplished previously, must be inspected as proposed in the NPRM.

The FAA also notes that the proposed method and inspection intervals are the same as those specified in paragraph IV ("Appendix") of the service bulletin, except when the repair was accomplished in accordance with a method approved by Boeing. (As stated in the "Differences Between Proposed Rule and Relevant Alert Service Bulletin" section of the proposal, although the service bulletin specifies that the manufacturer be contacted for disposition of certain repair conditions, this AD requires repair of those conditions to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA.) Because a method of repair obtained from Boeing is not defined in the service bulletin, it is unknown if the inspection procedures specified in the service bulletin are sufficient to adequately ensure the safety of the affected airplanes.

With regard to the commenters' contentions that developing special inspection methods for each repair will be cost prohibitive, the FAA finds that the commenters' concerns are based on repairs for large areas of damage. The FAA has determined that it is not possible to specify generic repair and inspection methods in the service bulletin or in the AD for large areas of damage. Such repairs would be unique because of the amount of damage that could occur. However, the FAA anticipates that there should be few initial cases of extensive damage for which FAA approval will be required, and after the initial inspections, the repetitive inspections are intended to detect any damage (i.e., cracking), before it becomes extensive. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request to Increase Repetitive Inspection Interval

One commenter requests that the proposed rule be revised to delete the requirement in paragraph (c)(1) to perform an HFEC inspection of repaired structure within 3,000 flight cycles. The commenter states that it does not expect

that cracking would occur within 3,000 flight cycles after the installation of that repair, and remarks, as stated previously, that, "It does not seem logical to require HFEC within 3,000 cycles from repair and then repeat at 15,000 cycle intervals."

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request. As discussed in the NPRM, there is concern that repairs accomplished previously on the affected airplanes may not be adequate to ensure the safety of the airplane fleet. The FAA finds that a threshold of 3,000 flight cycles after accomplishment of the repair provides operators adequate time to inspect repaired structure and ensures that any cracking will be detected in a timely manner. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request to Revise Accomplishment Instructions

Two commenters request that the proposed rule be revised to explain that removal of certain parts (including attachment hardware and seal retainer) is not necessary for accomplishment of the close visual inspection. One commenter requests that the proposed AD be revised to include a **NOTE** to this effect. That commenter justifies its request by stating that removal of certain parts is not necessary to visually inspect the frame. The other commenter expresses concern that accomplishing the procedures associated with removing the seal retainer—e.g., drilling fasteners through the frame, scraping sealant and paint finishes from the frame—every 3,000 flight cycles would increase the probability of manmade damage to the structure. The commenter states that an inspection program in which the seal retainer and cargo liner are not required to be removed should have about the same damage tolerance rating as the inspection program proposed in the NPRM, at about half the cost. The same commenter also suggests that the repetitive inspection interval for the HFEC inspection could be reduced from 15,000 to 6,000 flight cycles to account for not removing such parts during the visual inspections.

The FAA does not concur with the commenters' requests. The FAA has determined that cracking may initiate under the seal retainer and around the number 6 door stop. The FAA finds that to gain access to the web area to perform the detailed visual inspections, it is necessary to remove the same parts that are removed for the detailed and HFEC inspections of the doorway cutout frame webs, inner and outer chords, bear strap, and skin panel.

With regard to the commenter's concern about increasing the risk of structural damage, the FAA acknowledges that such removal of parts does increase the risk of manmade damage. However, the risk of such manmade damage must be balanced with the necessity to detect and correct operational damage such as that the inspections associated with this AD is intended to detect. In this case, the manufacturer's recommendation, as contained in the service bulletin, is for the removal of the seal retainer and the cargo liner. In consideration of the manufacturer's recommendation, as well as the nature and location of known cracking, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to remove such parts for the detailed visual and HFEC inspections.

With regard to the commenter's assertion that an inspection program that doesn't require removal of the seal retainer and cargo liner "should" have the same damage tolerance rating as the inspection program proposed in the NPRM, the FAA finds that the commenter provides no technical justification for such a claim. However, should the commenter develop an inspection procedure that can be shown to provide an adequate level of safety, the commenter may apply for approval of an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD.

No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request to Allow Credit for Inspections Accomplished Previously

Two commenters request that credit be given for inspections performed previously. The commenters state that the actions specified in the proposed AD have been accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD. One of the commenters specifically requests that the compliance time for the initial inspection be extended from 3,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD to 4,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, if inspections have been accomplished in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997. The commenter justifies its request by stating that it has found no crack on any affected airplane in its fleet. The commenter's rationale is that accomplishing the inspection at the threshold proposed in the NPRM would be very costly because it would impact the operator's normal maintenance schedules.

The FAA does not concur that a change to the final rule is necessary to give credit for work accomplished

previously. With regard to inspections accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD, operators are always given credit for work accomplished previously, by means of the phrase in the compliance section of the AD that reads "required as indicated, unless accomplished previously."

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request for an extension of the compliance time from 3,000 to 4,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD. The FAA has determined that an interval of 4,000 flight cycles would not address the identified unsafe condition in a timely manner. Though the commenter has not found cracking on any airplanes in its fleet, other operators have. The FAA finds the proposed compliance time of 3,000 flight cycles for initiating the required actions to be warranted, in that it represents an appropriate interval of time allowable for affected airplanes to continue to operate without compromising safety. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request to Revise Supplemental Structural Inspection Document (SSID)

One commenter, who otherwise supports the proposed rule, notes that the area subject to the proposed inspections is already subject to inspections in accordance with AD 98-11-03, amendment 39-10530 (63 FR 27455, May 19, 1998), which is the Supplemental Structural Inspection Program (SSIP) AD. The commenter therefore requests that the inspection be deleted from the SSIP.

The FAA finds that no change to the final rule is necessary in this regard. Boeing, not the FAA, is responsible for revisions to the SSID. However, the FAA will suggest to Boeing that, in the next revision to the SSID, the inspections required by this AD should be deleted from the SSID, and the service bulletin referenced by this AD should be added to Section 9 of the SSID, as provided for by the SSIP.

Request to Simplify the Format of the AD

One commenter requests that the proposed rule be revised to simplify the format. The commenter provided an example of how the proposed AD could be simplified; however, no justification is given for the commenter's request.

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request. The FAA infers from the comment that the commenter finds the format of the proposed AD difficult to follow. The FAA acknowledges that there are certain complexities to the AD. However, as described in the preamble of the NPRM,

this AD differs from the service bulletin only in the fact that repair of certain conditions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the method approved by the FAA rather than the manufacturer. This AD is intended to ensure that cracking is detected in a timely manner on both repaired and unrepaired airplanes. Based on the reports of cracking that the FAA has received, which were described in the preamble of the proposed rule, the FAA finds that the commenter's proposed format would not ensure that any cracking would be detected in a timely manner. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request to Revise Cost Impact

One commenter, who otherwise supports the proposed rule, requests that the cost of necessary repairs be included in the cost impact of the proposed AD. The commenter states that the cost impact does not include the time required to install repairs if cracking is found during an inspection.

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request. The cost impact of the AD is limited only to the cost of actions actually required by the rule. It does not consider the costs of "on condition" actions (that is, actions taken to correct an unsafe condition if found), because those actions would be required to be accomplished, regardless of AD direction, in order to correct an unsafe condition identified in an airplane and to ensure operation of that airplane in an airworthy condition, as required by the Federal Aviation Regulations. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Conclusion

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 changes described previously. The FAA has determined that these changes will neither increase the economic burden on any operator nor increase the scope of the AD.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 1,100 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 770 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 60 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required inspections, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the inspections required by this AD on U.S.

operators is estimated to be \$2,772,000, or \$3,600 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the 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 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 location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, 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 the following new airworthiness directive:

99-23-13 Boeing: Amendment 39-11409. Docket 97-NM-227-AD.

Applicability: All Model 727-200 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 (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 detect and correct fatigue cracking between the upper and lower sills of the number 1 cargo door, which could result in rapid decompression of the fuselage and consequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

Initial Inspection

(a) Perform a detailed visual inspection or a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection (as applicable) to detect cracks in the forward and aft frames (web, inner chord, and outer chord), bear strap, and fuselage skin between the upper and lower sills of the number 1 cargo door at BS 560 and BS 620. Accomplish the inspection at the time specified in paragraph (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable.

Note 2: For the purposes of this AD, a detailed visual inspection is defined as: "An intensive visual examination of a specific structural area, system, installation, or assembly to detect damage, failure, or irregularity. Available lighting is normally supplemented with a direct source of good lighting at intensity deemed appropriate by the inspector. Inspection aids such as mirror, magnifying lenses, etc., may be used. Surface cleaning and elaborate access procedures may be required."

(1) For any forward or aft frame (web, inner chord, and outer chord), bear strap, or fuselage skin that has not been repaired in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997: Inspect prior to the accumulation of 30,000 total flight cycles, or within 3,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin.

(2) For any forward or aft frame (web, inner chord, and outer chord) that has been repaired in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997: Inspect within 3,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin.

(3) For any bear strap, fuselage skin, or a combination of the frame web and chord (inner or outer) on either the forward or aft frame that has been repaired in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997: Inspect within 3,000 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, in accordance with a method

approved by the Manager, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

Note 3: Where there are differences between this AD and the referenced service bulletin, the AD prevails.

Note 4: The inspections specified in paragraph (a)(3) of this AD are not defined in the service bulletin.

Repetitive Inspections

(b) If no crack is detected during any inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, accomplish paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For any forward or aft frame (web, inner chord, and outer chord), bear strap, or fuselage skin identified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD: Repeat the detailed visual and HFEC inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at the times specified in paragraphs (b)(1)(i) and (b)(1)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Repeat the detailed visual inspection of the frame web at intervals not to exceed 3,000 flight cycles.

(ii) Repeat the detailed visual and HFEC inspections (as applicable) of the frame web, frame inner and outer chords, bear strap, and fuselage skin thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15,000 flight cycles.

(2) For any bear strap, fuselage skin, or a combination of the frame web and chord (inner or outer) on either the forward or aft frame identified in paragraph (a)(3) of this AD: Repeat the inspections of the repaired bear strap, fuselage skin, or combination of a repaired frame web and chord (inner or outer) thereafter at intervals not to exceed those approved by the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Repair

(c) If any crack is detected during any inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For any crack detected in the frame web, inner chord, or outer chord: Repair in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997. Prior to the accumulation of 3,000 flight cycles after accomplishment of the repair, accomplish the detailed visual and HFEC inspections specified in paragraph (a) of this AD. Repeat the detailed visual inspection of the frame web thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,000 flight cycles. Repeat the detailed visual and HFEC inspections (as applicable) of the frame web, inner chord, and outer chord thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15,000 flight cycles.

(2) For any crack detected in the fuselage skin, bear strap, or a combination of the frame web and chord (inner or outer): Repair and perform repetitive inspections in accordance with both a method and repetitive inspection interval approved by the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Note 5: The repairs and inspections specified in paragraph (c)(2) of this AD are not defined in the service bulletin.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, Seattle ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Note 6: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Seattle ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Incorporation by Reference

(f) Except as provided by paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(2), and (c)(2) of this AD, the actions shall be done in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727-53A0219, Revision 1, dated May 8, 1997. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124-2207. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on December 17, 1999.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 3, 1999.

D.L. Riggins,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99-29329 Filed 11-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-11408; AD 99-23-12]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all Dornier Model 328-100 series airplanes, that requires repetitive inspections to detect damage and discrepancies of various control cables and certain fairleads/swivel guides for the autopilot, elevator, rudder, aileron,

and engine; and corrective actions, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of the pilot's control cables for the autopilot, elevator, rudder, aileron, and engine, which could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Effective December 17, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 17, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from FAIRCHILD DORNIER, DORNIER Luftfahrt GmbH, P.O. Box 1103, D-82230 Wessling, Germany. 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: 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: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Dornier Model 328-100 series airplanes was published as a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** on February 26, 1999 (64 FR 9453). That action proposed to require repetitive inspections for chafing of various control cables, and replacement of any chafed cable with a serviceable cable. That action also proposed to expand the areas to be inspected to detect damage and discrepancies, and provide for corrective action, if necessary; add a requirement for repetitive inspections of certain fairleads/swivel guides to detect damage and other discrepancies, and corrective action, if necessary; and extend the compliance time for the initial inspections.

Comments

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