(ARAC). The FAA agreed that the proposed changes to § 33.27 were not completely harmonized with the proposed equivalent rules in the Joint Airworthiness Requirements—Engine (JAR–E) published by the European Joint Aviation Authority (JAA). The preamble to the final rule states that until the ARAC completes its work to harmonize § 33.27 with the equivalent rule in the JAR–E, the FAA should address engine overspeed test requirements for 30-second and 2-minute OEI engine ratings on a case by case basis. These special conditions reflect that policy and allow this applicant to proceed with the certification of these engine designs on the same basis as previous applicants seeking approval for 30-second and 2-minute OEI engine ratings.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.101, GEAE must show that GEAE models CT7–6D, CT7–6E and CT7–8 turboshaft engines meet the applicable provisions of the regulations incorporated by reference in Type Certificate No. E8NE or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change. The regulations incorporated by reference in the type certificate are commonly referred to as the ''original type certification basis.'' The original type certification basis for the CT7–6D engine is 14 CFR part 33, effective February 1, 1965, as amended by Amendments 33–1 through 33–5. The original type certification basis for the CT7–6E engine is 14 CFR part 33, effective February 1, 1965, as amended by Amendments 33–1 through 33–16. The original type certification basis for the CT7–8 engine is 14 CFR part 33, effective February 1, 1965, as amended by Amendments 33–1 through 33–17.

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 33) do not contain appropriate safety standards for the GEAE CT7–6D, CT7–6E and CT7–8 engines because of the 30-second OEI and 2-minute OEI engine ratings, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.16.

Special conditions, as appropriate, are issued in accordance with 14 CFR 11.49, as required by 14 CFR 11.28 and 11.29(b), and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with 14 CFR 21.101(b)(2).

Special conditions are applicable to the model for which they are issued. Should the type certificate for that model be amended later to include any other model that incorporates the same engine ratings, or should any other model already included on the same type certificate be modified to incorporate the same engine ratings, the special conditions would also apply to the other model under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.101(a)(1).

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the GEAE CT7–6D, CT7–6E and CT7–8 turboshaft engines. Should GEAE apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same engine ratings, the special conditions would apply to that model as well under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.101(a)(1).

Conclusion

This action affects only certain engine ratings for the GEAE CT7–6D, CT7–6E and CT7–8 turboshaft engines. It is not a rule of general applicability, and it affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA for approval of these ratings.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 33

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701–44702, 44704.

The Special Conditions

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the following special conditions are issued as part of the type certification basis for the GEAE Models CT7–6D, CT7–6E and CT7–8 turboshaft engines.

Section 33.4, Instructions for Continued Airworthiness.

In addition to the requirements of § 33.4, the mandatory inspection and maintenance actions required following the use of the 30-second or 2-minute OEI rating must be included in the airworthiness limitations section of the appropriate engine manuals.

Section 33.27, Turbine, Compressor, Fan, and Turbo-supercharger Rotors.

For engines having 30-second and 2-minute OEI ratings, in addition to the requirements of § 33.27(b), turbine and compressor rotors must have sufficient strength to withstand the conditions specified in one of the following tests for the most critically stressed rotor component of each turbine and compressor including integral drum rotors and centrifugal compressor, as determined by analysis or other acceptable means. The selection of the test from the following paragraph (a) or (b) of this section is determined by the speed defined in paragraph (a)(2) or (b)(2), whichever is higher.

(a) Test for a period of two and one-half minutes-

(1) At its maximum operating temperature except as provided in § 33.27(c)(2)(iv); and

(2) At the highest speed determined, in accordance with § 33.27(c)(2)(i) through (iv).

(3) This test may be performed using a separate test vehicle as desired.

(b) Test for a period of 5 minutes-

(1) At its maximum operating temperature except as provided in § 33.27(c)(2)(iv); and

(2) At 100 percent of the highest speed that would result from failure of the most critical component of each turbine and compressor or system in a representative installation of the engine when operating at 30-second and 2-minute OEI rating conditions; and

(3) The test speed must take into account minimum material properties, maximum operating temperature, and the most adverse dimensional tolerances.

(4) This test may be performed using a separate test vehicle as desired. Following the test, rotor growth and distress beyond dimensional limits for an overspeed condition is permitted for 30-second and 2-minute OEI ratings only, provided the structural integrity of the rotor is maintained, as shown by a procedure acceptable to the Administrator.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on May 21, 1999.

David A. Downey,

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

[FR Doc. 99–13637 Filed 5–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–89–AD; Amendment 39–11183; AD 99–11–12]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–400 Series Airplanes Powered by Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 747–400 series airplanes, that requires repetitive inspections to ensure proper installation of the engine thrust link components, and follow-on corrective action, if necessary; and replacement of the forward engine mount end cap assembly with an improved end cap assembly. Such replacement, when accomplished, will terminate the repetitive inspections. This amendment is prompted by a report of fatigue cracking of end cap bolts, caused by improper installation. Subsequent

investigation revealed that properly installed end caps also are subject to early fatigue cracking. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of the end cap assembly, which could lead to separation of the engine from the airplane in the event of a primary thrust linkage failure.

DATES: Effective July 2, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of July 2, 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: Tamara L. Anderson, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2771; 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 certain Boeing Model 747–400 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on May 20, 1998 (63 FR 27685). That action proposed to require repetitive inspections to detect improper installation and fatigue damage of the end cap of the forward engine mount, and replacement of the forward engine mount end cap assembly with an improved end cap assembly.

Clarification of the Rule

Since the issuance of the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), the FAA has clarified certain wording in the final rule to more accurately describe the inspection requirements, which include the actions required and the components to be inspected. The Summary of the proposed AD states that repetitive inspections are required ''to detect improper installation and fatigue damage of the end cap of the forward engine mount. * * *'' However, the final rule states that repetitive inspections are required ''to ensure proper installation of the engine thrust link components, and follow-on corrective action, if necessary. * * *''

The FAA considers that such clarification of the inspection requirements is necessary for several reasons. First, the FAA has determined that requiring operators ''to ensure proper installation,'' rather than ''to detect improper installation,'' more accurately describes the action required for the inspection. Second, the FAA points out that ''fatigue damage of the end cap,'' which involves the secondary load path, could not be detected until the forward engine mount was disassembled. In addition, the inspections specified by Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996, are inspections of the ''engine thrust link components,'' not the ''end cap'' itself. This inspection requirement also was clear in the proposed rule, which correlated the corrective action to the presence or absence of damage to the engine thrust link components. Therefore, the FAA has deleted ''fatigue damage'' from the inspection requirements and has changed ''end cap'' to ''engine thrust link components.'' The FAA adds that the engine thrust link components, which involve the primary load path, can be inspected with no disassembly of the forward engine mount required. The Summary and paragraph (a)(1) of the final rule have been clarified accordingly.

In addition, although it is implied in the proposed AD that the FAA requires any discrepancy or damage to be repaired by taking corrective action, the FAA has clarified this requirement in the final rule. The first sentence of the Summary of this AD now includes ''and follow-on corrective action, if necessary.''

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.

One commenter states that it is not affected by the proposal because it does not operate the affected airplanes. Another commenter generally supports the proposal.

Request to Withdraw the Proposed AD

One commenter states that ''regulatory action mandating incorporation of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283 [dated October 10, 1996] is unwarranted for PW4000 powered 747 aircraft.'' That commenter also states that this alert service bulletin was issued on the basis of one report of a broken end cap bolt by one operator of a Model 747–400 series airplane. In addition, the commenter states that the discrepancy was revealed during engine overhaul and that the cause of the bolt failure was attributed to a personnel error when the end cap was installed backwards. The commenter adds that the redesigned end cap specified in the alert service bulletin does not prevent improper installation and does not address the original issue of misinstallation. Further, the commenter states that, during routine magnetic particle inspections of the end caps and bolts, no cracked end caps or bolts have been found. The commenter also states that such an incident should not lead to the conclusion that an unsafe condition exists or is likely to exist.

The FAA does not concur that the alert service bulletin is unwarranted or that the proposed AD should be withdrawn. The FAA points out that the current configuration of the end cap has been shown to fail if it is installed backwards because the end cap would contact the adjacent bearing, which is loaded during each flight. In addition, the end cap has insufficient fatigue life for such loading, and may not prevent separation of an engine in the event of failure of the primary thrust load path. However, the FAA has determined that the redesigned end cap specified in the alert service bulletin will prevent the end cap from contacting the adjacent bearing even if the redesigned end cap is installed backwards.

The FAA acknowledges that, if the redesigned end cap was installed backwards, several problems could occur. First, only a portion of the threads of the fasteners would engage and the few engaged threads could strip, resulting in inadequate torque of the fasteners. Second, if the installation procedure was continued, a mechanical interference could occur between the fan case and the fastener heads. However, the FAA points out that, because inadequate torque of the fasteners could be easily detected, installation of the engine would not be continued until corrective action was taken. The new design also would prevent inadvertent loading of the secondary thrust load path, which is reserved for use in the event of a failure in the primary thrust load path.

In light of this information, the FAA has determined that the redesigned end cap would significantly reduce the probability of inadvertent error in engine installation. In addition, the FAA was informed by the manufacturer that the original end cap assembly, if installed correctly, has insufficient fatigue life to prevent separation of an engine in case of a primary thrust link failure.

Request To Correct the Name of the Component To Be Inspected

One commenter, the manufacturer, requests that the inspection described in the ''Explanation of Relevant Service Information'' and in paragraph (a)(1) of the proposed AD be changed from ''end cap of the forward engine mount'' to ''engine thrust link components'' in the final rule.

The FAA concurs with this request. As described earlier in the ''Clarification of the Rule'' paragraph, the FAA agrees that the ''engine thrust link components'' are the correct components to be inspected. The FAA points out that, although the alert service bulletin specifies an inspection of the ''forward engine mount,'' the FAA agrees with the manufacturer that the ''engine thrust link components'' are the appropriate components to be inspected. The FAA has made this change throughout the final rule, including the Summary and paragraph (a)(1). No change was made in the ''Explanation of Relevant Service Information'' because this paragraph does not appear in the final rule.

Request To Change a Reference to the Airplane Maintenance Manual

One commenter suggests changing a reference in the ''Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin'' of the proposed AD from ''Chapter 71–00–00 of the Boeing 747 Airplane Maintenance Manual (AMM)'' to ''paragraph (a)(2) of this AD.''

The FAA concurs. The FAA acknowledges that the reference to Chapter 71–00–00 of the AMM in the ''Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin'' of the proposed AD is incorrect because that chapter of the AMM does not include procedures for replacing the end cap and bolts. The FAA agrees that paragraph (a)(2) correctly references the appropriate work package of the alert service bulletin for such replacement procedures. However, the FAA has determined that further clarification is necessary, and has placed such clarification in the paragraph titled ''Additional Differences Between This AD and the Service Information,'' below. In that paragraph, the FAA has deleted the reference to the AMM and added that the end cap and bolts be replaced ''in accordance with the alert service bulletin referenced in paragraph (a)(2) of this AD.''

Request To Add a Statement Regarding Repair

One commenter requests adding ''repair all discrepancies or damage found in accordance with an approved FAA procedure* * *'' to the requirements of paragraph (a)(1)(ii) of the proposed AD.

The FAA acknowledges that adding a statement regarding the repair requirement is necessary for clarification of the final rule. As discussed earlier in the ''Clarification of the Rule'' paragraph, the FAA considers that the repair requirement was inherent in the proposed rule. The FAA agrees with the commenter that the repair requirement should be more explicit and has added this requirement to the final rule.

However, the FAA has determined that it is unnecessary to add that the repair must be ''in accordance with an approved FAA procedure.'' The FAA points out that because the repairs required by this AD are considered common industry practice, it is unnecessary to require that such repairs must be accomplished in accordance with an approved FAA procedure. Since the suggested change would increase the burden to the operator and require issuance of further rulemaking to allow opportunity for public comment, the FAA has determined that such a change would be inappropriate in light of the identified unsafe condition.

In light of this information, the FAA has added the repair requirement to paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(A) of the final rule, but has not added the requirement that the repair be accomplished ''in accordance with an approved FAA procedure.''

Request To Allow an Operator's Equivalent Procedure for Certain Tasks

One commenter states that it objects to paragraph (c) of the proposed AD because it eliminates the option to perform certain tasks in accordance with an operator's equivalent procedure. The commenter also states that operators often incorporate changes to maintenance manual procedures and work cards by resequencing or improving the work steps to improve efficiency. The commenter maintains that its operator's procedures are equivalent to those specified in the AMM and will ensure accomplishment of the work specified in the AMM. For these reasons, the commenter requests that paragraph (c) of the proposed AD be deleted.

The FAA concurs with the commenter's request to delete paragraph (c) of the proposed AD and to allow the use of an operator's equivalent procedure for accomplishment of certain actions required by the final rule. The FAA points out that it did not intend to require the accomplishment of access procedures prior to inspection and closure procedures after inspection in accordance with only the AMM. The FAA also intended to allow the accomplishment of access and closure procedures in accordance with an operator's equivalent procedure. The FAA has determined that accomplishment of the access and closure procedures, in accordance with an operator's equivalent procedure, and accomplishment of the inspection requirements, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996, will adequately address the identified unsafe condition and provide an acceptable level of safety.

In light of this, the FAA has deleted paragraph (c) that was included in the proposed AD, which did not allow the actions required by the proposed AD to be accomplished in accordance with an operator's equivalent procedure. In addition, the reference to paragraph (c) has been deleted from paragraphs (a) and (b) of the final rule.

Additional Differences Between This AD and the Service Information

Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283 divides the affected airplanes into two groups depending upon the particular engine configuration of the affected airplane, and provides different procedures depending upon group classification and engine on-wing flight cycles. Operators should note that, whereas the alert service bulletin specifies that operators of Group 1 airplanes should contact the manufacturer for disposition of the terminating action, this AD requires that the end cap and bolts be replaced in accordance with the alert service bulletin referenced in paragraph (a)(2) of this AD as terminating action.

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 previously described. 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 133 Model 747–400 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 36 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD: 35 Group 1 airplanes, and 1 Group 2 airplane.

It will take approximately 36 work hours per Group 1 airplanes (9 work hours per engine) to accomplish the required inspection at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this inspection on U.S. operators is estimated to be $75,600, or $2,160 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

It will take approximately 272 work hours per airplane (68 work hours per engine) for both Group 1 and Group 2 airplanes to accomplish the required replacement of the forward engine mount end cap and/or end cap bolts at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts will cost approximately $1,000 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this replacement on U.S. operators is estimated to be $623,520, or $17,320 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are 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:

99–11–12 Boeing: Amendment 39–11183. Docket 97–NM–89–AD.

Applicability: Model 747–400 series airplanes powered by Pratt & Whitney PW4000 engines, as listed in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996; 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 prevent possible separation of the engine from the airplane in the event of a primary thrust linkage failure, accomplish the following:

Initial Inspection and Corrective Actions

(a) For Group 1 airplanes, as identified in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996: Accomplish paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2), of this AD, as applicable.

(1) Within 500 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD, perform a detailed visual inspection (Work Package 1) to ensure proper installation of the engine thrust link components, in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

(i) If no attachment hardware is found loose or missing, and if no part shows signs of damage, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,000 hours time-in-service or 15 months, whichever occurs first, until the requirements of paragraph (a)(2) of this AD have been accomplished.

(ii) If any attachment hardware is found loose or missing, or if any part shows signs of damage, prior to further flight, accomplish the actions required by paragraphs (a)(1)(ii)(A) and (a)(1)(ii)(B).

(A) Repair any discrepancy or damage.

(B) Replace the existing end cap and end cap bolts of the forward engine mount end cap assembly with an improved end cap and end cap bolts (Work Package 2) in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

Terminating Action

(2) Replace the existing end cap and end cap bolts of the forward engine mount end cap assembly with an improved end cap and end cap bolts (Work Package 2), in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996, at the earlier of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii) of this AD. Accomplishment of the replacement constitutes terminating action for the requirements of this AD for Group 1 airplanes.

(i) Prior to the accumulation of 16,000 total flight cycles on any engine, or within 500 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later; or

(ii) Within 3 years after the effective date of this AD.

(b) For Group 2 airplanes, as identified in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996: Within 3 years after the effective date of this AD, replace the existing end cap bolts of the forward engine mount with improved end cap bolts (Work Package 3), in accordance with the alert service bulletin.

Spares

(c) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install on any airplane a forward engine mount end cap having part number 310T3026–1.

Alternative Method 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 2: 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) The inspections and replacement shall be done in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–71A2283, dated October 10, 1996. 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 July 2, 1999.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 20, 1999.

D.L. Riggin, Acting Manager,

Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–13483 Filed 5–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–ANE–19–AD; Amendment 39–11179; AD 99–11–08]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Aircraft Engines CF34 Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to General Electric Aircraft Engines (GE) CF34 series turbofan engines, that requires installation of a main fuel control (MFC) that incorporates a flange vent groove and installation of an MFC with improved overspeed protection. This amendment is prompted by reports of rapid uncommanded engine acceleration events. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent uncommanded engine accelerations, which could result in an engine overspeed, uncontained engine failure, and damage to the airplane.

DATES: *Effective date:* July 27, 1999. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of July 27, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from GEAE Technical Publications, Attention: N. Hanna MZ340M2, 1000 Western Avenue, Lynn, MA 01910; telephone (781) 594–2906, fax (781) 594–0600. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman Brown, Controls Specialist, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (781) 238–7181, fax (781) 238–7199.

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 General Electric Aircraft Engines (GE) CF34 series turbofan engines was published in the **Federal Register** on September 18, 1998 (63 FR 49877). That action proposed to require, within 800 hours time in service (TIS), or 120 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, installation of an MFC incorporating a flange vent groove. In addition, the action proposed to require installation of an MFC with improved overspeed protection: for CF34–3A1 and –3B1 series engines, installed on Canadair Regional Jet airplanes, within 4,000 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, or 24 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first; and for CF34–1A, –3A, –3A1, –3A2, and –3B series engines, installed on Canadair Challenger airplanes, at the next hot section inspection, or within 60 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first. The actions are required to be accomplished in accordance with GE CF34 Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. A73–18, Revision 1, dated September 24, 1997; CF34 ASB No. A73–32, Revision 2, dated May 29, 1998; CF34 ASB No. A73–33, Revision 1, dated May 29, 1998; and CF34 ASB No. A73–19, Revision 1, dated February 20, 1998.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were received on the proposal or the FAA's determination of the cost to the public.

Since the publication of the notice of proposed rule making (NPRM), GE has issued Revision 2, dated May 29, 1998, to ASB A73–32 that added effectivity information to the Planning Information section of ASB A73–32. GE has also issued Revision 1, dated May 29, 1998 to ASB 73–33 that added effectivity information to the Planning Information section of ASB A73–33. The ASB revisions have not affected the technical or economic content of this proposed AD. We have added the updated ASB revisions to paragraphs (a), (b)(1), and (b)(2) of the compliance section of this AD. GE has implemented the vent groove and improved overspeed protection design changes in new MFC's. In addition, we have made editorial changes to the compliance section of this AD to improve readability and to remove ambiguity. We changed the requirement ''with a flange vent groove reworked in accordance with'' in paragraph (a) to ''with a flange vent groove modified in accordance with.'' We made the change so that you are not restricted to installing only reworked MFC's, and to allow you to install a new MFC with the design improvements. We added the base part number 6078T55 of the MFC to each of the P0X numbers to remove any ambiguity over the MFC's that must be replaced. We changed the requirement ''Install a reworked MFC with improved overspeed protection'' in paragraph (b) to ''Install a serviceable MFC with improved overspeed protection.'' We made the change to allow you to install a new MFC that incorporates the improved overspeed protection design change, and so you are not restricted to installing only reworked MFC's. We added the word ''within'' to the requirements of paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) to allow you to perform the actions before reaching the specified calendar times after the effective date of the AD. We removed the new MFC P/N's from paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) and changed ''install MFC'' to ''install a serviceabl MFC.'' We removed the P/N's so that you will not have to request an alternate method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD if a new MFC P/N is certificated for use on the applicable engines. We also added a new paragraph (c) that defines a serviceable MFC.

After careful review of the available data, including the changes 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.

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