

The primary purpose of the rule contemplated by the Commission would be to inform Native American Tribes of shipments passing to or across the boundary of Tribal lands as a recognition of Tribal sovereignty as well as the need for Tribes to be aware of activities that occur on Tribal lands. While emergency preparedness would not be the main reason for developing such a rule, Tribes that do have emergency preparedness capabilities would benefit from notification.

### Specific Considerations

Before the NRC prepares a proposed rule on the subject, the NRC is seeking advice and recommendations on this matter from all interested persons. Comments accompanied by supporting reasons are particularly requested on the following questions arranged by topic:

#### A. Developing a List of Native American Tribe Contacts

A.1. In preparing the list of Tribal contacts, the NRC would most likely look to the list of Federally recognized Native American Tribes maintained by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), U.S. Department of the Interior. Is this an appropriate approach? Are there any other sources that the NRC should consider? (See the BIA website at <http://www.doi.gov/bureau-indian-affairs.html>).

A.2. How can the NRC ensure that contact information is kept current, particularly for smaller Tribes? In maintaining State contacts, the NRC provides each State with the opportunity to update its information annually. Should NRC follow the same approach for Tribal contacts?

A.3. How can licensees effectively and efficiently provide notification to Native American Tribes, particularly smaller Tribes, of a schedule change that would require updated notification by telephone at any time of day?

#### B. Minimizing the Licensees' Administrative Burden

B.1. In what ways can licensees comply with this advance notification requirement, while keeping their administrative burden at a minimum?

B.2. If a shipper is unable to make contact with a Tribe prior to or during a shipment, should the shipment proceed?

#### C. Identifying the Location of Tribes Along Shipment Routes

C.1. How can licensees effectively and comprehensively identify the location of Native American Tribes along a particular vehicle, rail, or vessel shipment route?

C.2. Should DOE and NRC licensees develop and maintain a central data base regarding the location of Tribal lands? Should NRC look to Geographic Information System (GIS) resources to provide licensees with information regarding the location of Tribal lands?

C.3. What types of Tribal lands should the rule apply to (e.g., Trust Lands, Fee Lands (i.e., lands owned by Native Americans but not held in trust by the Federal government), etc.)?

#### D. Safeguards Information

D.1. Should advance notification of spent fuel shipments be provided to any federally recognized Native American Tribe when spent fuel shipments are transported to or across tribal boundaries?

D.2 The NRC's "need-to-know" requirement for advance notification of spent fuel shipment information is found in 10 CFR 73.21. Should this requirement be broadened to include other entities, such as Federally recognized Native American Tribes?

D.3. Does wider dissemination of shipment information increase the risk to safeguarding spent fuel shipments (i.e., protecting public health and safety)? How should the NRC address any increase in risk compared with the benefits to be gained from Tribal notification?

D.4. How should the rule address the point of contact for Safeguards Information in the context of Tribal notification?

D.5. A recipient of Safeguards Information must expend resources to ensure the information is handled properly. Are there Tribes who may not wish to be recipients of Safeguards Information?

D.6. If a Tribal government receives Safeguards Information, should the NRC review the Tribe's actions to control and protect Safeguards Information?

D.7. 10 CFR 73.21(a) states that "information protection procedures employed by State and local police forces are deemed to meet the information protection requirements of § 73.21(b) through (i)." Should the NRC determine the ability of Tribal governments to protect Safeguards Information and, if so, how?

D.8. Should the contemplated rule include an exemption to the notification requirement if there is reason to believe that a Tribe will not be able to protect the Safeguards Information from disclosure? What basis would the NRC need for granting such an exemption?

D.9. Should 10 CFR 73.37(f) be changed to a permissive form? That is, should the licensee be permitted rather than required to release Safeguards

Information to responsible Tribal government officials?

The preliminary views expressed in this notice may change in light of comments received. If the proposed rule is developed by the Commission, there will be another opportunity for additional public comment in connection with that proposed rule.

### List of Subjects

#### 10 CFR Part 71

Criminal penalties, Hazardous materials transportation, Nuclear materials, Packaging and containers, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

#### 10 CFR Part 73

Criminal penalties, Hazardous materials transportation, Exports, Imports, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and Security measures.

The authority citation for this document is: 42 U.S.C. 2201; 42 U.S.C. 5841.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of December, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Annette L. Vietti-Cook,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 99-32929 Filed 12-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98-NM-56-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2, A300-B2K, A300 B4-2C, A300 B4-100, and A300 B4-200 Series Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the superseding of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all Airbus Model A300 B2, A300 B2K, A300 B2-200, A300 B4, A300 B4-100, and A300 B4-200 series airplanes, that currently requires certain structural inspections and modifications. This action would require that those inspections be accomplished on additional airplanes. This action also would require new repetitive inspections for airplanes in

certain configurations at revised thresholds and intervals. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct corrosion and cracking of the wings and fuselage, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by January 20, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-56-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 Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-2110; fax (425) 227-1149.

#### **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-56-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-56-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

##### **Discussion**

On April 10, 1996, the FAA issued AD 96-08-08, amendment 39-9574 (61 FR 18661, April 29, 1996), applicable to all Airbus Model A300 B2, A300 B2K, A300 B2-200, A300 B4, A300 B4-100, and A300 B4-200 series airplanes, to require structural inspections and modifications. That action was prompted by reports of incidents involving fatigue cracking and corrosion in transport category airplanes that are approaching or have exceeded their economic design goal. These incidents have jeopardized the airworthiness of the affected airplanes. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent degradation of the structural capability of the affected airplanes.

##### **Actions Since Issuance of Previous Rule**

Since the issuance of that AD, Airbus has issued Revision 6 of Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0162, dated March 20, 1996. The inspections and modifications described in Revision 6 of the service bulletin are identical to those in Revisions 4 and 5 of the service bulletin (which were referenced in AD 96-08-08 as appropriate sources of service information). However, the effectivity listing of Revision 6 of the service bulletin has been revised to include airplanes on which Airbus Modifications 3275 and 5724 or Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0161 has been accomplished (i.e., Configuration 2 airplanes). The remaining affected airplanes (Configuration 1) were subject to the requirements of AD 96-08-08.

Airbus also has issued Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995, which describes procedures for inspections of an additional area between fuselage frames FR10 and FR10A. The actions in Revision 2 are similar to those described in the original version and Revision 1 of Service Bulletin A300-53-278 (the service bulletin number was revised in Revision 2 to A300-53-0278), which

were referenced in AD 96-08-08 as appropriate sources of service information; except, the inspections have been revised from eddy current inspections to visual inspections. In addition, the effectivity listing of Revision 2 of the service bulletin has been revised to include airplanes on which Airbus Modification 1446 has been accomplished (i.e., Configuration 3 airplanes). The remaining affected airplanes (Configurations 1 and 2) were subject to the requirements of AD 96-08-08.

Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletins is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition. The DGAC classified these service bulletins as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 90-222-116(B)R4, dated March 27, 1996, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

##### **FAA's Conclusions**

These airplane models are manufactured in France and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

##### **Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule**

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would supersede AD 96-08-08 to continue to require certain structural inspections and modifications. The proposed AD would require that those inspections be accomplished on additional airplanes. The proposed AD also would require new repetitive inspections for airplanes in certain configurations at revised thresholds and intervals. The new actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously, except as discussed below.

## Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin

Operators should note that, although the service bulletins specify that the manufacturer may be contacted for disposition of certain repair conditions, this proposal would require the repair of those conditions to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA.

## Cost Impact

There are approximately 13 airplanes of U.S. registry that would be affected by this proposed AD.

The actions that were previously required by AD 96-08-08, and retained in this AD, take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the currently required actions on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$120 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The new inspection that is proposed in this AD action would take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$180 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the current or 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 removing amendment 39-9574 (61 FR 18661, April 29, 1996), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

**Airbus Industrie:** Docket 98-NM-56-AD.

Supersedes AD 96-08-08, Amendment 39-9574.

**Applicability:** All Model A300 B2, A300 B2K, A300 B2-200, A300 B4-2C, A300 B4-100, and A300 B4-200 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

**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 (h) 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 detect and correct corrosion and cracking of the wings and fuselage, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

### Inspection and Modification

(a) Accomplish the inspections and modifications contained in the Airbus service bulletins listed below prior to or at the thresholds identified in each of those service bulletins, or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after April 13, 1992 (the effective date of AD 92-02-09, amendment 39-8145), whichever occurs later, except as provided in paragraph (d) of this AD for the service bulletin identified in paragraph (a)(8) of this AD. Required inspections shall be repeated

thereafter at intervals not to exceed those specified in the corresponding service bulletin for the inspection. After April 13, 1992 (the effective date of AD 92-02-09, amendment 39-8145), the actions shall only be accomplished in accordance with the latest revision of the service bulletins specified.

(1) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-103, Revision 4, dated June 30, 1983; or Revision 5, dated February 23, 1994;

(2) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-126, Revision 7, dated November 11, 1990; or Revision 8, dated September 18, 1991;

(3) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-146, Revision 7, dated April 26, 1991;

**Note 2:** Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-146 provides for a compliance threshold of within 5 years after the date of issuance of French airworthiness directive 90-222-116(B), issued on December 12, 1990, the accomplishment of which is required by AD 85-07-09, amendment 39-5033.

(4) For Configuration 1 airplanes identified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0162, Revision 6, dated March 20, 1996; Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-162, Revision 4, dated November 12, 1990; Revision 5, dated March 17, 1994; or Revision 6, dated March 20, 1996. After the effective date of this new AD, only Revision 6 of the service bulletin shall be used.

(5) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-196, Revision 1, dated November 12, 1990; as amended by Service Bulletin Change Notice 1.A., dated February 4, 1991, or Revision 2, dated March 17, 1994.

**Note 3:** Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-196 provides for a compliance threshold of within 6,000 landings after accomplishment of Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-194, accomplishment of which is required by AD 87-04-12, amendment 39-5536.

(6) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-225, Revision 2, dated May 30, 1990;

(7) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-226, Revision 4, dated November 12, 1990; or Revision 5, dated September 7, 1991;

**Note 4:** Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-226 provides for a compliance threshold of within 5 years after the issuance of French airworthiness directive 90-222-116(B), issued on December 12, 1990; but not later than 20 years after first delivery; the accomplishment of which is required by AD 90-03-08, amendment 39-6481.

(8) For Configuration 1 and 2 airplanes identified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995; Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-278, dated November 12, 1990; or Revision 1, dated March 17, 1994;

(9) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-54-045, Revision 4, dated January 31, 1990; or Revision 6, dated February 25, 1994;

(10) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-54-060, Revision 2, dated September 7, 1988, and Change Notice 2.A., dated February 13, 1990; or Revision 3, dated February 25, 1994;

(11) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-54-063, Revision 1, dated April 22, 1987, and Change Notice 1.A., dated February 13, 1990; or Revision 2, dated February 25, 1994; and

(12) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-54-066, Revision 1, dated February 15, 1989, and

Change Notice 1.A., dated February 13, 1990; or Revision 2, dated February 25, 1994.

(b) Accomplish the inspections and modifications contained in the Airbus service bulletins listed below prior to or at the thresholds identified in each of those service bulletins, or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after March 29, 1996 (the effective date of AD 96-08-08, amendment 39-9574), whichever occurs later. Required inspections shall be repeated thereafter at intervals not to exceed those specified in the corresponding service bulletin for the inspection.

(1) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0194, Revision 2, including Appendix 1, dated August 19, 1993;

**Note 5:** Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0194 provides for a compliance threshold of prior to the accumulation of 36,000 landings for Model A300 B2 series airplanes on which the modification described in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-165 has not been accomplished and for Model A300 B2 series airplanes on which that modification has been accomplished prior to the accumulation of 24,000 landings on the airplane. Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0194 also provides for a compliance threshold of prior to the accumulation of 12,000 landings after the accomplishment of Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-165 (for Model A300 B2 series airplanes on which the modification described in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-165 has been accomplished on or after the accumulation of 24,000 landings on the airplane).

(2) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-166, Revision 3, including Appendix 1, dated July 12, 1993;

(3) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0167, Revision 1, including Appendix 1, dated May 25, 1993;

(4) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0168, Revision 3, including Appendix 1, dated November 22, 1993;

(5) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0180, Revision 1, dated March 29, 1993;

(6) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-57-0185, Revision 1, including Appendix 1, dated March 8, 1993; and

**Note 6:** The Airbus service bulletins specified in paragraphs (b)(2), (b)(3), (b)(4), (b)(5), and (b)(6) of this AD provide for a compliance threshold of prior to the accumulation of 36,000 landings (for Model A300 B2 series airplanes); 30,000 landings (for Model A300 B4-100 series airplanes); and 25,000 landings (for Model A300 B4-200 series airplanes) after the effective date of French airworthiness directive 93-154-149(B), issued on September 15, 1993.

(7) Airbus Service Bulletin A300-54-0084, dated April 21, 1994.

(c) For Configuration 2 airplanes identified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0162, Revision 6, dated March 20, 1996: Accomplish the inspections contained in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0162, Revision 6, dated March 20, 1996, prior to or at the thresholds identified in the service bulletin; or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later. Required inspections shall be repeated thereafter at intervals not to exceed those specified in the service bulletin for the inspection.

(d) For Configuration 1 and 2 airplanes identified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995: Accomplish the inspections contained in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995; at the time specified in paragraph (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this AD, as applicable. Repeat the inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,600 flight cycles. Accomplishment of the inspections required by this paragraph constitutes terminating action for the inspections required by paragraph (a)(8) of this AD.

(1) For airplanes that have not been inspected in accordance with paragraph (a) and (a)(8) of this AD prior to the effective date of this AD: Inspect at the time specified in paragraph (d)(1)(i) or (d)(1)(ii) of this AD, as applicable.

(i) For Configuration 1 airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 18,300 total landings, or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(ii) For Configuration 2 airplanes: At the earlier of the times specified in paragraphs (d)(1)(ii)(A) or (d)(1)(ii)(B) of this AD.

(A) At the time specified in paragraphs (a) and (a)(8) of this AD.

(B) Prior to the accumulation of 22,000 total landings, or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes that have been inspected in accordance with paragraph (a) and (a)(8) of this AD prior to the effective date of this AD: Perform the next inspection within 3,600 landings after accomplishing the last inspection, or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(e) For Configuration 3 airplanes identified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995: Accomplish the inspections contained in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995, prior to the accumulation of 26,000 total flight cycles; or within 1,000 landings or 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later. Repeat the inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,000 flight cycles.

**Note 7:** Accomplishment of the inspections specified in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-0278, Revision 2, dated November 10, 1995, is considered acceptable for compliance with the significant structural details (SSD) inspection 536206 of "Airbus Industrie A300 Supplemental Structural Inspection Document" (SSID), Revision 2, dated June 1994, required by AD 96-13-11, amendment 39-9679 (61 FR 35122, July 5, 1996).

#### Corrective Action

(f) If any discrepant condition identified in any service bulletin referenced in this AD is found during any inspection required by this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish the corresponding corrective action specified in the service bulletin, except as specified in paragraph (g) of this AD.

(g) If any crack is found during any inspection required by this AD; and the applicable service bulletin specifies to

contact Airbus for appropriate action: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate; or the DGAC (or its delegated agent). For a repair method to be approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116, as required by this paragraph, the Manager's approval letter must specifically reference this AD.

#### Alternative Methods of Compliance

(h) 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 8:** 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

(i) 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.

**Note 9:** The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 90-222-116(B)R4, dated March 27, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 15, 1999.

**D.L. Riggan,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-32983 Filed 12-20-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-NM-30-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200, -300, and -400 Series Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the superseding of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 747-200, -300, -400 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspections to detect cracking of