

pressure deck. The commenter adds that the drain system includes different drains and drain lines, and the drain lines are mounted in the wheel well area and the area above the fairings below the wing. The commenter notes that the phrase "wing landing gear wheel well" is used interchangeably with the phrase "wheel well of the main landing gear" throughout the proposed AD.

We agree with the commenter, and we have changed the applicable sections in this final rule for clarification to the phrase "wheel well of the landing gear."

The same commenter asks that the unsafe condition in the Summary section be changed to "The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent ice accumulation on the lateral flight control cables and/or components due to water entering the wheel well of the MLG and freezing, which could restrict or jam control cable movement, resulting in degraded or loss of controllability of the airplane." The commenter states that this would provide a better explanation of the unsafe condition.

We agree to add "and/or components," but we do not agree to add the word "degraded." The phrase "loss of controllability of the airplane" adequately describes the end-level effect on the airplane. "Degraded controllability" would not necessarily result in loss of control of the airplane, unless there were other contributing factors. We do not list all possible conditions that could result from ice accumulation—only the end-level effect.

Request To Clarify Certain Sections in the Preamble

The same commenter asks that the first and third paragraphs of the Explanation of Relevant Service Information section in the preamble of the proposed AD be changed to remove the phrase "located in the wheel wells of the main landing gear of the left and right wings" for clarification. The commenter also asks that the same phrase in the first paragraph of the Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule section be removed for clarification. The commenter also asks for minor editorial changes.

We acknowledge and agree with the commenter's remarks on the preamble of the proposed AD; however, the sections referred to are not restated in this final rule. Therefore, no change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request To Change Paragraph (b)(1)

Two commenters ask for changes to paragraph (b)(1) of the proposed AD. One commenter states that the tests

specified in paragraph (b)(1) do not allow any leeway to the airline. The commenter adds that operators may find it easier to use a vacuum or "snake" to do the test and notes that this paragraph should be changed to allow other methods to verify the drains are open and clean. The other commenter suggests that the drains at left buttock line (LBL) 45.75 and LBL 65.00 be used as an alternative means for determining the condition of the drainage of the canted pressure deck.

We do not agree to change paragraph (c)(1) of the final rule (paragraph (b)(1) of the proposed AD). We acknowledge that alternate inspection methods can be used to ensure that the drains are open and clean if such methods are submitted to the FAA for approval as an alternative method of compliance (AMOC), as provided in paragraph (g)(1) of this final rule. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request To Change Paragraph (b)(2)

One commenter asks that the last sentence in paragraph (b)(2) of the proposed AD be changed to state, "Accomplishment of paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this AD replaces the requirements in paragraph (a) of this AD." The commenter states that the sentence is not accurate as written because doing the procedures specified in Work Package 2 does not verify that the drains are open and clean. The commenter adds that paragraph (b)(2) does not terminate the requirements in paragraph (a) of the proposed AD; it merely replaces them with new requirements.

We do not agree with the commenter. The inspection procedures required by paragraph (c)(2) of the final rule (paragraph (b)(2) of the proposed AD) meet the requirements specified in paragraph (a) of the final rule, which is to verify that all drains are open and clean. We acknowledge that the inspections required by paragraph (c)(1) of the final rule also address inspections of the drains, but the test in that paragraph goes beyond the inspection requirements in paragraph (a) of this final rule. No change to the final rule is necessary in this regard.

Request To Withdraw Proposed AD

Three commenters state that, since the issuance of AD 89-12-07, they have had no findings of drainage problems in the canted pressure deck area on the subject airplanes. The comments are as follows:

- One commenter states that it has incorporated numerous service bulletin modifications to improve the drainage of the subject area. The commenter adds that it would be interesting to determine

if such modifications have been incorporated on the airplanes specified in the proposed AD and if the inspections and cleaning required by AD 89-12-07 have been done, as the commenter has done. The commenter also notes that the proposed AD is not necessary for Model 747-400 series airplanes because all the improvement modifications were incorporated per the service bulletins.

- One commenter states that the actions required by the proposed AD are done per AD 89-12-07, and per the current maintenance review board (MRB) inspections.

- One commenter provides data showing its inspection results and states that, as the data indicate, it has found virtually no trapped water in the canted pressure deck, and based on this, the actions required by the proposed AD are not necessary.

We infer that the commenters are asking that the proposed AD be withdrawn, and we do not agree. We have received several reports on Model 747-400 series airplanes, and other airplanes on which the service bulletin modifications have been incorporated to improve the drainage of the subject area, and water is still entering the landing gear wheel well and freezing. Operators of these airplanes have been inspecting the subject area per the requirements in AD 89-12-07. In addition, because the procedures specified in MRBs vary from operator to operator, there are no assurances that each operator's MRB contains the equivalent actions required by this AD. We have determined that the inspections specified in the existing MRB and AD 89-12-07 do not provide an adequate level of safety; therefore, we have determined that this final rule is appropriate and warranted. No change is made to the final rule in this regard.

Request To Extend Repetitive Test Intervals

One commenter asks that the repetitive interval for the cabin pressurization tests required by paragraph (d) of the proposed AD be extended to every 8 years so the tests can be at the "D" check interval because some operators have been using this interval for several years. The commenter states that the intervals specified in the proposed AD are taken from the referenced service information, and seem to be based on the MRB intervals and the present average intervals used by 747 operators. The commenter adds that the proposed AD should provide technically possible maximum intervals with substantiation. The commenter notes that the referenced service information and the