9 CFR Part 130

Animals, Birds, Diagnostic reagents, Exports, Imports, Poultry and poultry products, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Tests.

Accordingly, we are proposing to amend 9 CFR parts 93, 94 and 130 as follows:

PART 93—IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ANIMALS, BIRDS, AND POULTRY, AND CERTAIN ANIMAL, BIRD, AND POULTRY PRODUCTS; REQUIREMENTS FOR MEANS OF CONVEYANCE AND SHIPPING CONTAINERS

1. The authority citation for part 93 would be revised to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 102–105, 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134d, 134f, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

§§ 93.430 and 93.431 [Removed and reserved]

2. In part 93, §§ 93.430 and 93.431 would be removed and reserved.

§§ 93.522 and 93.523 [Removed]

3. In part 93, §§ 93.522 and 93.523 would be removed.

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, FOWL PEST (FOWL PLAGUE), EXOTIC NEWCASTLE DISEASE, AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, HOG CHOLERA, AND BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

4. The authority citation for part 94 would continue to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 147a, 150ee, 161, 162, and 450; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134f, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 42 U.S.C. 4331 and 4332; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

5. In § 94.1, paragraph (b) would be revised to read as follows:

§ 94.1 Regions where rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists; importations prohibited.

* * * * *

(b) The importation of any ruminant or swine or any fresh (chilled or frozen) meat of any ruminant or swine [1] that originates in any region where rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, as designated in paragraph (a) of this section, or that enters a port in or otherwise transits a region in which rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, is prohibited:

(1) Except as provided in part 93 of this chapter for wild ruminants and wild swine; and

(2) except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section for meat of ruminants or swine that originates in regions free of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease but that enters a port or otherwise transits a region where rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists; and

(3) except as provided in § 94.4 of this part for cooked or cured meat from regions where rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists.

* * * * *

PART 130—USER FEES

§ 130.1 [Amended]

6. The authority citation for part 130 would be revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5542; 7 U.S.C. 1622; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 102–105, 111, 114, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134d, 134f, 136, and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

7. In § 130.1, the definition of *Animal Import Center* would be amended by removing the last sentence.

Done in Washington, DC, this 4th day of August, 1998.

Joan M. Arnoldi,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 98–21363 Filed 8–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

[1] Importation of animals and meat includes bringing the animals or meat within the territorial limits of the United States on a means of conveyance for use as sea stores or for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–150–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive testing of certain main tank fuel boost pumps to identify those with degraded performance, and replacement of degraded pumps with new or serviceable pumps. This proposal also would require eventual replacement of the existing low pressure switches for boost pumps located in the main fuel tanks with higher threshold low pressure switches, which, when accomplished, would terminate the repetitive testing. This proposal is prompted by reports of engine power loss caused by unsatisfactory performance of the fuel boost pumps. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent fuel suction feed operation on both engines without flight crew indication, and possible consequent multiple engine power loss.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 24, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–150–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dorr M. Anderson, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANM–140S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2684; fax (425) 227–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by

interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 98–NM–150–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–150–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The FAA has received several reports of engine power loss, including one total power loss event, on Boeing Model 737–300, –400, and –500 series airplanes. These events were the result of degraded performance of the fuel boost pumps located in the main tanks. In each case, the low pressure indication system did not indicate that the pumps were operating unsatisfactorily.

Degradation of the fuel boost pumps involved in the reported engine power loss events was caused by corrosion of a braze connection in the rotor of the pump motor. This corrosion results in a decrease in the impeller rotation speed, which reduces the output pressure of the pump. Only boost pumps manufactured by the General Electric Company (GEC) of the United Kingdom are affected by this problem. Other FAA-approved main tank fuel boost pumps have not exhibited evidence of this corrosion problem.

Further investigation revealed that the low pressure switches for the fuel boost pumps were set at a pressure threshold that is too low. These pressure switches will not always detect degraded pump performance and will not provide indication of the problem to flight and maintenance crews until the output fuel pressure drops to an extremely low level. Low pressure switches with the improper pressure threshold are installed downstream of all FAA-approved main tank fuel boost pumps.

If not corrected, degraded fuel boost pump performance that is not detected by the low pressure switch and annunciated on the flight deck could result in multi-engine suction feed operation without flight crew indication, and possible consequent multiple engine power loss.

The reported engine power loss events occurred on Model 737–300, –400, and –500 series airplanes. However, the subject fuel boost pump system on the Model 737–100 and –200 series airplanes is similar to that on the affected Model 737–300, –400, and –500 series airplanes. Therefore, those Model 737–100 and –200 series airplanes may be subject to the same unsafe condition revealed on the Model 737–300, –400, and –500 series airplanes.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–28A1114, Revision 1, dated April 2, 1998, which describes procedures for repetitive testing of certain main tank fuel boost pumps to identify those with degraded performance, and replacement of degraded pumps with new or serviceable pumps. The alert service bulletin also describes procedures for replacement of the existing low pressure switches for boost pumps located in the main fuel tanks with higher threshold low pressure switches, which eliminates the need for the repetitive testing. Accomplishment of the replacement of the low pressure switches specified in the alert service bulletin is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require accomplishment of the actions specified in the alert service bulletin described previously, except as discussed below.

Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin

Operators should note that, although the alert service bulletin recommends accomplishing the pump output pressure testing within 180 days, the FAA has determined that an interval of 180 days would not address the identified unsafe condition in a timely manner. In developing an appropriate compliance time for this proposed AD, the FAA considered not only the manufacturer's recommendation, but the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition, the average utilization of the affected fleet, availability of spare fuel boost pumps, and the time necessary to perform the testing (two hours). In light of all of these factors, the FAA finds a 90-day compliance time for initiating the proposed actions to be warranted, in that it represents an appropriate interval of time allowable for affected airplanes to continue to operate without compromising safety.

The alert service bulletin does not restrict dispatch with main tank fuel boost pumps inoperative, in accordance with the Minimum Equipment List. However, this proposed AD would not allow dispatch of any airplane with any main tank fuel boost pump inoperative until the initial test of the boost pumps is accomplished. This restriction will limit the exposure to fuel suction feed operation.

The alert service bulletin also recommends that the low pressure switches should be replaced on airplanes equipped with one or more boost pumps manufactured by GEC or Argo-Tech. Further, the alert service bulletin does not recommend replacement of any low pressure switches for airplanes on which pumps manufactured by TRW are installed. However, this proposed AD would require, within 3 years, replacement of low pressure switches for all airplanes, regardless of the type of boost pump installed. The FAA has determined that the pressure threshold of the existing low pressure switches is set too low to allow timely identification of any fuel boost pump with degraded performance.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 2,772 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 1,140 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

For airplanes equipped with one or more main tank fuel boost pumps manufactured by GEC, it would take between 2 and 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed testing, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed testing on U.S. operators of these airplanes is estimated to be between $136,800 and $547,200, or between $120 and $480 per airplane, per testing cycle.

For all airplanes, it would take between 4 and 6 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed modification, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would be provided by the airplane manufacturer at no cost to the operator. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed modification on U.S. operators is estimated to be between $273,600 and $410,400, or between $240 and $360 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no

operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed 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 proposed herein would 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 proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, 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 copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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:

Boeing: Docket 98–NM–150–AD.

Applicability: Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 series airplanes; line numbers 1 through 3002 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 (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 fuel suction feed operation on both engines without flight crew indication, and possible consequent multiple engine power loss, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes equipped with one or more main tank fuel boost pumps manufactured by the General Electric Company (GEC), of the United Kingdom: Accomplish paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(4) of this AD.

(1) As of the effective date of this AD, no airplane shall be dispatched with any main tank fuel boost pump inoperative unless the initial testing required by paragraph (a)(2) of this AD has been accomplished.

(2) Test each GEC-manufactured main tank fuel boost pump to determine the output pressure, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–28A1114, Revision 1, dated April 2, 1998, at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii) of this AD. If the fuel boost pump output pressure measured during the testing required by this paragraph is less than 23 pounds per square inch gauge (psig), as measured at the input to the engine fuel pump; or less than 36 psig, as measured at the fuel boost pump low pressure switch; prior to further flight, replace the fuel boost pump with a new or serviceable fuel pump, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–28A1114, Revision 1, dated April 2, 1998.

(i) Prior to the accumulation of 3,000 total flight hours, or within 1 year since date of manufacture of the airplane, whichever occurs first; or

(ii) Within 90 days after the effective date of this AD.

(3) Repeat the testing required by paragraph (a)(2) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 6 months, until accomplishment of the requirements of paragraph (a)(4) of this AD.

(4) Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, replace all four low pressure switches installed downstream of the main tank fuel boost pumps with higher threshold low pressure switches, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–28A1114, Revision 1, dated April 2, 1998. Accomplishment of this replacement constitutes terminating action for the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD.

(b) For airplanes equipped with one or more main tank fuel boost pumps manufactured by Argo-Tech: Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, replace all four low pressure switches installed downstream of the main tank fuel boost pumps with higher threshold low pressure switches, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–28A1114, Revision 1, dated April 2, 1998.

(c) For airplanes equipped with all four main tank fuel boost pumps manufactured by Thompson Rand Wooldridge (TRW): Within 3 years after the effective date of this AD, replace all four low pressure switches installed downstream of the main tank fuel boost pumps with higher threshold low pressure switches, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–28A1114, Revision 1, dated April 2, 1998.

(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 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.

(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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 3, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–21262 Filed 8–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–190–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Saab Model SAAB 2000 series airplanes, that currently requires deactivation of certain floormat heaters in the cabin area. In addition, that AD provides for optional terminating action for that deactivation. This action would remove the optional terminating action of the existing AD and would add airplanes to the applicability of the existing AD.