ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Fokker Aircraft USA, Inc., 1199 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. 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: Mark Quam, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2145; fax (206) 227–1149.

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 Fokker Model F28 Mk 0100 series airplanes was published in the Federal Register on March 30, 1995 (60 FR 16390). That action proposed to require the installation of modified Passenger Service Unit (PSU) panel lenses. That action also proposed to require a onetime post-installation inspection to detect corrosion or deterioration of the PSU connectors, and correction of discrepancies, and application of

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 supports the proposal.

One commenter requests that the proposed action be issued as two separate AD's: one to require replacement of the lenses, and the other to require the one-time inspection for corrosion. As justification for this request, the commenter points out that each of these requirements affects a different group of airplanes, and the respective service bulletins recommend different compliance times for accomplishing each of the actions. Further, this commenter, a U.S. operator, states that the proposed requirement to inspect airplanes immediately after the installation of the new panel lenses would ground airplanes on which the installation had been accomplished prior to the effective date of the final rule. For example, this operator states that it has already accomplished the proposed installation of new lenses on 23 of its affected airplanes; however, because the compliance time for the inspection

[required by proposed paragraph (b)] would be "prior to further flight after accomplishing the installation [of the new panel lenses]," this operator would be required to immediately conduct the corrosion inspection of these airplanes. This situation would effectively ground this operator's airplanes until the inspection was conducted. By separating the proposal into two AD's, each with an appropriate and separate compliance time, operators would be alleviated from having to ground airplanes in order to immediately inspect airplanes that have had the new lenses installed at a previous time.

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request that the action be issued as two separate rules. The FAA combined the two actions into one proposed rule since both of the referenced service bulletins applied to the same item (the PSU). By requiring both actions to be conducted concurrently, it was the FAA's intent to save the affected operators from the expenses associated with having to access the PSU twice; that is, one time for the lens installation and another time for the inspection. Because of such costs, the FAA did not anticipate that operators would want to conduct these two actions independently. However, the FAA now recognizes the problems that operators could encounter when trying to comply with the proposed requirements as currently written. In light of the information provided by the commenter, the FAA finds no reason why the two actions cannot be conducted at separate times. Accordingly, the FAA has retained both actions in this single final rule, but has revised the final rule to provide for a compliance time of 9 months for the accomplishment of both actions. Additionally, the final rule has been revised to indicate that only affected airplanes (i.e., those listed in the effectivity listing of the respective service bulletin) will be required to accomplish each of the actions.

This same commenter requests that the proposed compliance time for the corrosion inspection be extended since there may be a problem in obtaining parts for necessary repairs. Specifically, this commenter points out that a portion of the repair procedures would require installation of gaskets in two electrical receptacles in the PSU. The commenter states that the manufacturer of these gaskets has not yet ordered the raw stock in order to fabricate the gaskets and does not have a projected date for the fabrication of the gaskets; therefore, that manufacturer cannot offer a delivery schedule for the parts required for the repair. This situation would put

affected operators at a disadvantage when attempting to comply with the repair requirements of the proposed rule.

The FAA does not concur that an extension of the compliance time for inspection is warranted. The FAA has contacted the manufacturer of the gaskets to determine if a parts availability problem would exist with respect to meeting the compliance time of this rulemaking action. The manufacturer advised that the gaskets come as part of a kit, and it currently has 600 of these kits on hand. It can provide additional kits upon request within 9 weeks of receiving an order. Based on this information, the FAA finds that ample repair parts will be available to operators within the 9month compliance time of this final rule; therefore, an extension of the compliance time is not appropriate.

This same commenter requests that proposed paragraph (c) be clarified. The commenter points out that, as currently written, paragraph (c) would prohibit the installation of any PSU with the part numbers (P/N) "10-1178-()" or "10-1571–()" on any affected airplane. The notation "-()" in this case indicates that any number(s) could be added as the last "dash number" of these P/N's, but regardless of that dash number, the part could not be installed. The commenter points out that this is misleading. The commenter states that some of the modified PSU's that would be required to be installed by paragraph (a) do not have totally different part numbers; some retain the first six numbers of the original P/N, but have different "dash numbers" added to the end of it. For example, P/N 10-1178-40 is an unmodified part that cannot be installed; its modified counterpart is P/ N 10-1178-59 and is permitted to be installed. As is evident in this example, the first six numbers of both of these P/ N's are the same; only the last two "dash numbers" are different. However, as paragraph (c) is proposed, neither of these parts would be permitted to be installed on an airplane, since that paragraph states that all P/N's with "10–1178–" as the first six numbers cannot be installed.

The FAA concurs that clarification is necessary. The FAA has revised the final rule to call out the specific part numbers of those parts that are not eligible for installation, and to specify the location where these parts may not be installed.

This same commenter considers that the economic information provided in the preamble to the proposal is understated, and that the associated costs are much greater than what the