affected by the proposal. The commenter states that listing the series of the affected airplane model in the proposal would avoid confusion. The commenter notes that attempting to list all exclusions, as in the proposal, would require listing all future series and derivatives of future models, which would be impossible. The FAA concurs. The final rule has been revised to specify that the rule is applicable to Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 airplanes.–

This commenter also requests that the proposal be revised to specify the service bulletins referenced in Fokker Report Number SE-278, "F27 Aging Aircraft Project—Final Document,' Issue 3, dated February 1, 1993 (hereinafter referred to as the "Fokker Report"), rather than merely referencing Part II of the Fokker Report, as was done in the proposal. The commenter requests this change because Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57–68, which was referenced in Part II of the Fokker Report, has been revised since issuance of the Fokker Report. Thus, this commenter contends that referring to the Fokker Report will not reflect this latest revision to that service bulletin. One commenter notes that the Rijksluchtvaartdienst (RLD), which is the airworthiness authority of the Netherlands, has issued a correction to Netherlands Airworthiness Directive (BLA) 91-058/5 (A), dated July 16, 1993, to reference Revision 1 of Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57-58, dated May 17, 1993.

The FAA concurs in part. Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57–68, Revision 1, dated May 17, 1993, was revised to correct the reference to the Netherlands airworthiness directive number, to add further explanatory information in the Description section of the service bulletin, and to make minor editorial changes to the Accomplishment Instructions. The FAA finds that none of these changes are substantive in nature; therefore, these changes do not warrant a revision to the specific service information referenced in the final rule. However, the FAA recognizes that operators may choose to comply with Revision 1 of that service bulletin. For those operators, a new NOTE 2 has been added to paragraph (a) of the final rule stating that compliance with Revision 1 of that service bulletin would constitute compliance with the requirements of Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57-68, dated July 17, 1992, which is referenced in the Fokker Report. Further, when the Fokker Report is revised to incorporate substantive revisions of service bulletins referenced in it, the FAA may consider

further rulemaking to incorporate those changes. –

Several commenters request that the proposal be revised to include the modification of certain lower stringers in the outer wing of the airplane described in Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57-70. These commenters contend that the threshold, resource requirements, and modification procedures specified in Fokker Service Bulletin 57–70 are identical to those described in Fokker Service Bulletin 57–68; the only difference is that Fokker Service Bulletin 57–68 specifies modification of certain upper stringers in the outer wing of the airplane. Fokker Service Bulletin 57-68 is referenced in the Fokker Report. These commenters assert that the modifications specified in both of these service bulletins should be included in the requirements of the proposed rule. Further, these commenters note that the RLD has classified Fokker Service Bulletin F27/ 57-70 as mandatory and has issued Netherlands Airworthiness Directive (BLA) 93-094 in order to ensure that the modification is accomplished on airplanes in the Netherlands.

The FAA does not concur that a revision to the rule to include a requirement for the additional modification should be made at this time. To do so would necessitate, under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, reissuing the notice, reopening the period for public comment, considering additional comments received, and eventually issuing a final rule. The FAA does not consider it appropriate to delay issuance of this final rule further in order to undertake those procedures. However, the FAA may consider further rulemaking action to require modification of the lower stringers in which cracking was detected coincidentally while accomplishing the modification described in Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57-68.-

Several commenters request an extension of the proposed compliance date of January 1, 1995, to accomplish the modification described in Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57-68, which is one of the service bulletins referenced in the Fokker Report. For airplanes that have accumulated more than 30,000 total landings, that Fokker service bulletin recommends accomplishment of the modification of certain upper stringers of the outer wing prior to January 1, 1995. These commenters state that such a compliance time would impose a tremendous economic burden, since a majority of the airplanes in their fleet have already accumulated more than 30,000 total landings; therefore,

some of these commenters suggest a compliance date of January 1, 1996, instead. One of these commenters requests that the compliance time be revised to an interval that coincides with the operator's regularly scheduled maintenance.–

The FAA concurs that the compliance time for accomplishing the modification described in Fokker Service Bulletin F27/57-68, Revision 1, dated May 17, 1993, may be extended to January 1, 1996, for airplanes that have accumulated more than 30,000 total landings. However, the FAA finds that in order to ensure safety in the interim, an additional x-ray inspection must be performed until such time that the airplane is modified, or prior to January 1, 1996. This extension to the compliance time should allow operators to accomplish the modification coincidentally with regularly scheduled maintenance. Accordingly, the final rule has been revised to add a new paragraph (b) to specify this provision. –

As a result of recent communications with the Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, the FAA has learned that, in general, some operators may misunderstand the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. The FAA points out that all airplanes identified in the applicability provision of an AD are legally subject to the AD. If an airplane has been altered or repaired in the affected area in such a way as to affect compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been added to this final rule to clarify this requirement. -

Additionally, the FAA has recently reviewed the figures it has used over the past several years in calculating the economic impact of AD activity. In order to account for various inflationary costs in the airline industry, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to increase the labor rate used in these calculations from \$55 per work hour to \$60 per work hour. The economic impact information, below, has been revised to reflect this increase in the specified hourly labor rate.–

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