figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $80,004, or $708 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 a substantial direct effect 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, it is determined that this final rule does not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

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:

99–27–10 Airbus Industrie: Amendment 39–11491. Docket 99–NM–222–AD.

Applicability: Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes, certificated in any category; except those on which Airbus Modifications 06267 and 07340 have been accomplished during production.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise 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 fire warning from terminating prematurely, which could result in an unnoticed, uncontained engine/auxiliary power unit (APU) fire, accomplish the following:

Modifications

(a) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, accomplish the wiring modifications to the engine and APU fire detection system in the relay box 282VU and the electronics rack 90VU in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A310–26–2024, Revision 04, dated March 5, 1999 (for Model A310 series airplanes); or A300–26–6038, dated March 5, 1999, or Revision 1, dated September 8, 1999 (for Model A300–600 series airplanes); as applicable.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, International Branch, ANM–116, 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, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(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.

Incorporation by Reference

(d) The modifications shall be done in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A310–26–2024, Revision 04, dated March 5, 1999; Airbus Service Bulletin A300–26–6038, dated March 5, 1999; or Airbus Service Bulletin A300–26–6038, Revision 1, dated September 8, 1999; 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 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 1999–238–286(B), dated June 2, 1999.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on February 8, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 23, 1999.

Vi L. Lipski,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–12 Filed 1–3–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–241–AD; Amendment 39–11486; AD 99–27–05]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767–200, –300, and –300F Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 767–200, –300, and –300F series airplanes, that requires replacement of the hydraulic reducer fitting in the return port of the alternate brake selector valve with a new restrictor fitting. This amendment is prompted by a report indicating that a brake housing had fractured due to high loads associated with brake vibration during landing gear retraction, which allowed the torque rod to swing free. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of the brake housing in the torque rod region, which could reduce the braking capability of the airplane and/or prevent the extension of a main landing gear by any method.

DATES: Effective February 8, 2000.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of February 8, 2000.

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: David Herron, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2672; 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 767–200, –300, and –300F series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on August 4, 1998 (63 FR 41481). That action proposed to require replacement of the hydraulic reducer fitting in the return port of the alternate brake selector valve with a new restrictor fitting.

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 concurs with the requirements of the proposed AD. The Air Transport Association (ATA) of America states that one of its members does not currently operate any airplanes affected by the proposed rule, and another member has no objection to the proposed rule.

Request To Revise the Discussion Section

One commenter states that it does not agree that the brake vibration is caused by excessive flow of hydraulic fluid into the alternate system metering valves during gear retract braking, as described in the Discussion section of the proposed AD. The commenter contends that the gear retract braking system, common to Model 757, 747–400, and 777 series airplanes, and to Model 767 series airplanes equipped with steel brakes, has demonstrated trouble-free service experience in all of those airplane models without brake vibration. The brake vibration that has occurred during gear retract braking on Model 767 series airplanes equipped with Boeing part number (P/N) S160T300-series carbon brakes is attributed to the friction-material characteristics of the carbon brakes. Reducing the brake-pressure onset rate consistently reduces peak brake-torque amplitudes and brake vibration levels, when present.

The new carbon brake, Boeing P/N S160T4000–210, for Model 767 series airplanes, uses a new carbon heatsink that has demonstrated extremely stable dynamic characteristics during laboratory and flight tests. Therefore, replacement of the existing carbon brakes, P/N S160T300-series, with the new carbon brake will, in itself, alleviate the high loads associated with brake vibration, without replacing the hydraulic restrictor fitting. The commenter recommends revising the Discussion section to read ''Brake vibration during gear retract braking can be reduced on the existing carbon brakes by reducing the hydraulic flow to the brakes.''

The FAA does not concur that the cause of the brake vibration on Model 767–200, –300, and –300F series airplanes is due to the brake material and not the gear retract braking system. In addition, it is not necessary to revise the Discussion section, as that section does not appear in the final rule.

Because the brake system comprises a group of components that include the brake friction material and gear retract brakes, which are subsets of the brake system, the FAA considers each component to be a contributor to the unsafe condition. Additionally, Boeing Service Bulletin 767–32–0152, dated June 6, 1996, and Revisions 1 and 2 of that service bulletin, do not specify that the cause of the vibration is the brake material, but only that the vibration occurs in airplanes equipped with carbon brakes. In fact, the third paragraph of the Summary section of Revision 1 of the service bulletin states that ''Installation of the restrictor fitting will reduce the flow into the alternate-system metering valves during gear retract braking. This will reduce peak torque levels and vibration of the landing gear during retract braking.''

Request To Change the Applicability of the Proposal

The commenter states that since the brake vibration is associated only with P/N S160T300-series carbon brakes, the applicability of the AD should be revised to read ''Model 767–200, –300, and 300F series airplanes equipped with P/N S160T300-series carbon brakes; certified in any category.'' The FAA infers that the commenter considers that it is a combination of carbon brake material and the excessive onset of hydraulic pressure that results in the unsafe condition; and that brakes manufactured with a ceram-metallic composite, while benefiting from the change, do not exhibit the unsafe condition the FAA seeks to correct through the issuance of this AD.

The FAA concurs that the brake vibration is associated only with airplanes equipped with Boeing P/N S160T300-series carbon brakes. The FAA also agrees with the manufacturer that including the specified part number in the applicability of the final rule correctly identifies those airplanes with the unsafe condition, and has revised the final rule accordingly. (The applicability of this AD continues to include the same airplanes ''1 through 607 inclusive;'' however, the term ''line positions,'' which was used in the proposed AD, has been changed to ''line numbers'' in this AD.)

Request To Revise Certain Terminology

One commenter states that, with reference to an alternative means (method) of compliance (AMOC), an ''equivalent'' level of safety rather than an ''acceptable'' level of safety should be considered. The commenter provides no justification for its request.

The FAA does not concur that the level of safety should be specified as ''equivalent'' rather than ''acceptable.'' When considering any AMOC request, the Manager of the Seattle Aircraft Certification Office evaluates the request and determines whether the proposed AMOC request is acceptable (*i.e.,* whether the proposed AMOC adequately addresses the unsafe condition). If so, the manager approves the request, even if it is not technically ''equivalent'' to the method of compliance required by the AD. No change to the final rule is necessary.

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

Cost Impact

There are approximately 373 Model 767–200, –300, and –300F series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 86 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 4 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate

is $60 per work hour. Required parts will cost approximately $104 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $29,584, or $344 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:

99–27–05 Boeing: Amendment 39–11486. Docket 97–NM–241–AD.

Applicability: Model 767–200, –300, and –300F series airplanes, line numbers 1 through 607 inclusive; equipped with part number S160T300-series carbon brakes; 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 failure of the brake housing in the torque rod region, which could reduce the braking capability of the airplane and/or prevent the extension of a main landing gear, accomplish the following:

Replacement

(a) Within 360 days after the effective date of this AD, replace the hydraulic reducer fitting in the return port of the alternate brake selector valve with a new restrictor fitting, in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 767–32–0152, dated June 6, 1996; Revision 1, dated June 27, 1996; or Revision 2, dated July 10, 1997.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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.

Special Flight Permits

(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.

Incorporation by Reference

(d) The replacement shall be done in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 767–32–0152, dated June 6, 1996; Boeing Service Bulletin 767–32–0152, Revision 1, dated June 27, 1996; or Boeing Service Bulletin 767–32–0152, Revision 2, dated July 10, 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.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on February 8, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 22, 1999.

Vi L. Lipski,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–11 Filed 1–3–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99–NM–31–AD; Amendment 39–11492; AD 99–27–11]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAC 1–11 200 and 400 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to to all British Aerospace Model BAC 1–11 200 and 400 series airplanes, that requires replacing the thrust reverser control unit selector valve with a new or modified valve and inspecting for proper rigging of the thrust reverser cable drums and thrust reverser control unit selector valve detent, and corrective actions, if necessary. This amendment also requires revising the Airplane Flight Manual to provide the flight crew with procedures to address uncontrolled operation of the thrust reverser system. 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 provide the flight crew with procedures in the event of uncommanded deployment of the thrust reverser, and to prevent uncommanded deployment of the thrust reverser in flight or on the ground, which could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.