

that operators may find corrosion or damage during the required inspections, or fastener holes may be damaged during accomplishment of the optional modification.

We do not concur with the commenter's request to add a reference to corrosion or damage. The inspections described in the referenced service bulletin and required by this AD are intended only to reveal cracking related to the identified unsafe condition. If any corrosion or damage is found during accomplishment of an action required by this AD, an operator would be required—regardless of AD direction—to correct the corrosion or damage to ensure that the airplane is operated in an airworthy condition as required by the Federal Aviation Regulations.

Related to this, we infer that the rationale for the commenter's request is to ensure that repairs of corrosion and other damage may be approved by a delegated Designated Engineering Representative (DER). We do not agree that any change is necessary to meet the commenter's intent. If corrosion or damage is found, and the Manager of the Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO) has authorized a Boeing Company DER to approve an alternative method of compliance for this AD, then the Boeing Company DER may approve a repair if it is structurally adequate per the FAA's delegation letter.

We concur, however, with the commenter's request to revise paragraph (c) of this final rule to add a reference to the optional modification. We note that paragraph (c) of the proposed AD states that it applies to any cracking found during any inspection required by the AD. This would include any inspection specified in the procedures for the optional modification. We find that adding the reference requested by the commenter may clarify that any cracking found during the optional modification must be repaired before further flight. Thus, for clarification, we have revised paragraph (c) of this AD to specify that the repair provisions in that paragraph apply to any cracking found during an inspection required by this AD, including cracking found during accomplishment of the modification specified in paragraph (d) of this AD.

Request To Clarify Inspection Threshold

The commenter requests that we revise paragraph (d) of the proposed AD to clarify that, if the optional modification is accomplished, the threshold for the repetitive inspections of Zone B is extended to the post-modification threshold specified in Tables 1 through 3 of Figure 1 of the

service bulletin. The proposed AD does not include the words "post-modification" before the word "threshold." The commenter does not state any justification for its request.

We infer that the commenter is concerned that, because there are other thresholds specified in the service bulletin, operators may be confused about the new threshold for the repetitive inspections of Zone B. We concur that this clarification may be helpful and have revised paragraph (d) of this AD accordingly.

Request To Revise Inspection Terminology, Add Inspection Definition

The commenter requests that we revise paragraph (b) of the proposed AD to refer to a "detailed visual inspection" instead of a "detailed inspection." The commenter also requests that we add an AD note defining a "detailed visual inspection." The commenter points out that this note has appeared in other ADs.

We do not concur with the commenter's request to revise the inspection terminology. The term "detailed visual inspection" was changed to "detailed inspection" in Revision 2003.1 of the Air Transport Association of America (ATA)/MSG-3 document, "ATA Operator/Manufacturer Scheduled Maintenance Development." We find that this terminology should be readily understood by all affected operators, and no change to the terminology is necessary.

We do concur with the commenter's request to add the standard AD note defining a "detailed inspection." This note was inadvertently omitted from the proposed AD. Therefore, we have added a new Note 2 to this AD and renumbered subsequent notes accordingly.

Request To Clarify Area of Inspection

The commenter requests that we revise the "Summary" section of the proposed AD to clarify the area of inspection. The commenter states that the statement that the proposed AD would require, "repetitive inspections to find fatigue cracking between the seal ribs of the front spar web of the wing" is not accurate. The commenter states that inspections also extend outboard of the outboard seal rib to front spar station inboard (FSSI) 713.

We concur with the intent of the commenter's request; however, we find that the subject inspection area extends to FSSI 711, not FSSI 713 as stated by the commenter. We have revised the "Summary" of this final rule accordingly. We find that this does not

expand the scope of the proposed AD because paragraph (b) of the proposed AD states that the inspections must be accomplished "per the Accomplishment Instructions" of Boeing Special Attention Service Bulletin 747-57-2313, Revision 1, dated February 21, 2002. The "Summary" section of a proposed AD is intended to provide only a very general description of the proposed requirements, while the preamble more completely describes the proposed requirements.

Request To Revise Preamble

The commenter requests that we make the following changes to the preamble of the proposed AD:

- In the "Discussion" section of the proposed AD, identify the model on which the 24-inch crack in the front spar web of the right wing was found as a Boeing Model 747-200 series airplane, not a Model 747-100 series airplane.
- In the "Discussion" section of the proposed AD, state that the cracks originated from a hole common to a rib post on the front spar at FSSI 655.70, not FSSI 656.
- In the "Related Rulemaking" section of the proposed AD, state that both AD 90-17-18, amendment 39-6702 (55 FR 33279, August 15, 1990), and AD 95-12-26, amendment 39-9279 (60 FR 34107, June 30, 1995), refer to Boeing Service Bulletin 747-57A2259 as the appropriate source of information for actions required by those ADs.

We partially agree with the commenter's requests:

- We agree that the original report of cracking was on a Boeing Model 747-200 series airplane, not on a Model 747-100 as stated in the proposed AD. The unsafe condition associated with this AD is addressed on Model 747-200 series airplanes by the rulemaking action associated with Rules Docket No. 2001-NM-228-AD, which we issued as a notice of proposed rulemaking on February 24, 2003 (68 FR 10185, March 4, 2003).
- Section 1.C., "Reason," of Boeing Special Attention Service Bulletin 747-57-2313, Revision 1, states that the hole from which the cracking originated was common to a rib post on the front spar at FSSI 656. Thus, the proposed AD is consistent with the service bulletin, and the change requested by the commenter is not necessary.

- AD 95-12-26 supersedes AD 90-17-18. Thus, the proposed AD should have referred to the requirements of AD 95-12-26 instead of AD 90-17-18.

Regardless of these issues, neither the "Discussion" nor the "Related Rulemaking" section is restated in this