

beyond the immediate locality in which the particular prevailing rate employees are employed."

On January 1, 1998, the minimum wage for the state of Oregon increased to \$6.00 per hour. Under section 532.205 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, the highest minimum wage applicable within a wage area must be applied to the entire wage area. Pay rates for NAF FWS employees stationed in Adams, Spokane, and Walla Walla Counties, WA, would have been increased to the higher minimum wage amount for the state of Oregon even though there are no NAF FWS employees working in Umatilla County, OR. OPM published an interim rule making this change and provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, OPM did not receive any comments. Based on the previous recommendation of FPRAC, the interim rule is being adopted as a final rule without any changes.

#### **Regulatory Flexibility Act**

I certify that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they will affect only Federal agencies and employees.

#### **List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532**

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

Accordingly, under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 5343, the interim rule (62 FR 66973) amending 5 CFR part 532 published on December 23, 1997, is adopted as final with no changes.

Office of Personnel Management.

**Janice R. Lachance,**

*Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-5004 Filed 2-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

---

#### **OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT**

#### **5 CFR Part 532**

RIN 3206-AH58

#### **Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Norfolk, Massachusetts, Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area**

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Personnel Management is issuing a final rule to abolish the Norfolk, Massachusetts, nonappropriated fund Federal Wage

System wage area and redefine its five counties as areas of application to nearby wage areas for pay-setting purposes. This change is being made because the closure of the Naval Air Station at South Weymouth, MA, left the Department of Defense without an activity in the wage area capable of hosting local wage surveys.

**DATE:** This regulation is effective on March 31, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jennifer Hopkins, (202) 606-2848, FAX: (202) 606-0824, or email to jdhopkin@opm.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 23, 1996, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) published an interim rule (61 FR 49649) to abolish the Norfolk, MA, nonappropriated fund (NAF) Federal Wage System (FWS) wage area and redefine its five counties having continuing FWS employment. The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, the statutory national labor-management committee responsible for advising OPM on matters concerning the pay of FWS employees, recommended by majority vote that we abolish the Norfolk, MA, NAF wage area and redefine its five counties as areas of application to nearby NAF wage areas. Norfolk County, Plymouth County, and Suffolk County, MA, were redefined to the Middlesex, MA, NAF wage area. Barnstable County and Nantucket County, MA, were redefined to the Newport, Rhode Island, NAF wage area. This change was necessary due to the closure of the Norfolk wage area's host activity, the Naval Air Station South Weymouth, which left the wage area without an activity having the capability to conduct annual local wage surveys.

Employees being paid rates from the Norfolk, MA, NAF wage schedule were converted to new wage schedules on November 15, 1996. No permanent employee's wage rate was reduced as a result of this change. The interim rule provided a 30-day period for public comment, during which we did not receive any comments. Therefore, the interim rule is being adopted as a final rule.

#### **Regulatory Flexibility Act**

I certify that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they will affect only Federal agencies and employees.

#### **List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532**

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information,

Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

Accordingly, under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 5343, the interim rule (61 FR 49649) amending 5 CFR part 532 published on September 23, 1996, is adopted as final with no changes.

Office of Personnel Management,  
**Janice R. Lachance,**  
*Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-5005 Filed 2-26-99; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

---

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Federal Aviation Administration**

#### **14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 97-NM-254-AD; Amendment 39-11051; AD 99-05-02]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### **Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 747 series airplanes, that requires a one-time detailed visual inspection of the outboard sequence carriage attachment fitting for the presence and condition of a shim and any loose fastener, and follow-on corrective actions, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by a report that a piece of the left wing inboard foreflap came off during a landing approach and struck and penetrated the airplane fuselage. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent the failure of the outboard sequence carriage fitting, which could allow the wing inboard foreflap to separate and penetrate the fuselage, possibly injuring passengers and crewmembers.

**DATES:** Effective April 5, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of April 5, 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 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on April 15, 1998 (63 FR 18341). That action proposed to require a one-time detailed visual inspection of the outboard sequence carriage attachment fitting for the presence and condition of a shim, and follow-on corrective actions, if necessary.

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

**Issuance of Proposed Rule Is Unwarranted**

One commenter considers that issuance of the proposed rule is unwarranted. The commenter states that the reason for the inspection of the outboard foreflap fitting is because an overhauled flap did not have a shim installed, which caused the foreflap to break apart during landing approach. The commenter also states that this condition caused damage to the aircraft fuselage, and a slight roll during flight, but no noticeable changes to the flight characteristics. The commenter points out that, although it is performing the inspections in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, dated April 10, 1997, it does not agree that the inspection should be mandated for several reasons.

First, the 747 Component Maintenance Manual (CMM) 57-52-31 clearly includes procedures for installation of the shim, which specify that the gap is not to exceed 0.003 inch. Second, although it appears that CMM procedures were not followed by the overhaul facility during overhaul of the foreflap that broke apart in flight, this is no reason to require all operators to perform the inspection. The commenter adds that, although individual operators occasionally make errors in approved maintenance procedures that require an operator to inspect its fleet for conformity to type certification, the FAA does not then require all operators

to accomplish the same inspections as those of one errant operator. In addition, neither the alert service bulletin nor the NPRM provides any reason to believe that another operator or overhaul facility would have made the same error.

The FAA does not concur that issuance of the proposed rule is unwarranted. The FAA has considered not only that the condition (excessive gap) may exist on other airplanes of the same type design, but also the consequences of this type of maintenance error. In addition, the FAA has determined that exceeding the specified gap (0.003 inch) on an installed fitting could result in puncturing the fuselage skin (adjacent to passenger seats) and injuring passengers and crewmembers. In light of this, the FAA considers that the actions required by this AD are necessary and that issuance of this final rule will ensure an adequate level of safety for the affected fleet.

**Request To Correct the Applicability**

One commenter [the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is the airworthiness authority for the United Kingdom], points out a contradiction in the proposed AD regarding the number of airplanes affected. The CAA states that the cost impact information of the proposal indicates that approximately 1,147 airplanes are affected, whereas the applicability of the proposal refers to line numbers 1 through 1,122 inclusive.

Another commenter states that the line number effectiveness should be 1 through 1,116, and that this change is included in Boeing Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, Revision 1, dated June 18, 1998. The commenter also reports that line numbers 1,117 through 1,122 were inspected at the manufacturer's facility prior to delivery.

The FAA concurs with the commenters' requests to correct the applicability of this AD. The FAA has determined that it is appropriate to exclude those airplanes (line numbers 1,117 through 1,122) that have been inspected prior to delivery, and has confirmed that the effectiveness of Revision 1 of the service bulletin includes line numbers 1 through 1,116. The FAA has determined that there are 991 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet and 213 airplanes of U.S. registry that are affected by this AD. The cost impact information, below, has been revised accordingly. In addition, the FAA has revised the applicability of the final rule to indicate line numbers 1 through 1,116 inclusive, instead of 1 through 1,122 inclusive.

**Request To Correct a Typographical Error**

The CAA points out that, in the applicability of the proposed AD, the reference to "47-100B" should be "747-100B." The FAA concurs. The final rule has been changed accordingly.

**New Service Information**

Since issuance of the proposed AD, the FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, Revision 1, dated June 18, 1998. This new revision is essentially the same as the original issue of this service bulletin, which was cited in the proposed AD as the appropriate source of service information for accomplishment of the actions required. However, Revision 1 reduces the number of airplanes included in the service bulletin effectiveness (as stated previously), adds a supplemental fastener kit and optional fasteners, clarifies certain procedures, and adds additional references.

The FAA has determined that the inspection and follow-on corrective actions required by paragraph (a) of the final rule may be accomplished in accordance with either of those service bulletins. The final rule has been revised accordingly.

**Editorial Changes to the Final Rule**

The FAA has determined that it is necessary to clarify what prompted this amendment in the Summary section of the AD by adding a more detailed description of the damage that occurred. The text now reads that a piece of the left wing inboard foreflap came off during a landing approach "and struck and penetrated the airplane fuselage." The final rule has been changed accordingly.

The FAA also has determined that it is necessary to clarify the intent of the final rule by specifying the types of discrepancies (missing, loose, or migrated shim; and loose fasteners) to be identified during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD. Paragraph (a) and the Summary section of the final rule has been revised accordingly.

The FAA also has determined that it is necessary to further clarify paragraph (a) of this AD. The FAA has added that follow-on corrective actions are required "if any discrepancy is detected," and that the corrective actions are to be accomplished in accordance with the applicable chapter of the Boeing Airplane Maintenance Manual specified in either the previously referenced alert service bulletin or Revision 1. Paragraph (a) of this AD has been revised accordingly.

## 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 991 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 213 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the required inspection, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$12,780, or \$60 per airplane.

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:

**99-05-02 Boeing:** Amendment 39-11051. Docket 97-NM-254-AD.

**Applicability:** Model 747-100, 747-200B, 747-200F, 747-200C, 747SR, 747-100B, 747-300, 747-100B SUD, 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F series airplanes; having line numbers 1 through 1,116 inclusive; 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 (b) 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 the failure of the outboard sequence carriage fitting, which could allow the wing inboard foreflap to separate and penetrate the fuselage, possibly injuring passengers and crewmembers, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 1,500 landings or 18 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, perform a one-time detailed visual inspection of the outboard sequence carriage attachment fitting to detect any discrepancy (missing, loose, or migrated shim; and loose fasteners) in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, dated April 10, 1997, or Boeing Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, Revision 1, dated June 18, 1998. If any discrepancy is detected, accomplish follow-on corrective actions in accordance with the applicable chapter of the Boeing Airplane Maintenance Manual specified in either of the service bulletins.

(b) 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 Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. 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.

(c) 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.

(d) The actions shall be done in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, dated April 10, 1997, or Boeing Service Bulletin 747-57A2302, Revision 1, dated June 18, 1998. 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.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on April 5, 1999.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 18, 1999.

**Darrell M. Pederson,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 99-4630 Filed 2-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98-NM-238-AD; Amendment 39-11052; AD 99-05-03]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 757-200 Series Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 757-200 series airplanes, that requires replacement of the stringer clip(s) with a new stringer clip(s), and modification of the life raft support structure and/or life raft doors, as applicable. This amendment is prompted by a report that certain life raft stowage compartments and certain life raft doors are understrength. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent a life raft falling from its stowage compartment, and consequently injuring nearby occupants or delaying or impeding the evacuation of passengers during an emergency landing.