

challenge the admissibility of the information subject to a protective order. The Immigration Judge may not find the information inadmissible solely because it is subject to a protective order.

(h) *Seal.* Any submission to the Immigration Judge, including any briefs, referring to information subject to a protective order shall be filed under seal. Any information submitted subject to a protective order under this paragraph shall remain under seal as part of the administrative record.

(i) *Administrative enforcement.* If the Service establishes that a respondent, or the respondent's attorney or accredited representative, has disclosed information subject to a protective order, the Immigration Judge shall deny all forms of discretionary relief, except bond, unless the respondent fully cooperates with the Service or other law enforcement agencies in any investigation relating to the noncompliance with the protective order and disclosure of the information; and establishes by clear and convincing evidence either that extraordinary and extremely unusual circumstances exist or that failure to comply with the protective order was beyond the control of the respondent and his or her attorney or accredited representative. Failure to comply with a protective order may also result in the suspension of an attorney's or an accredited representative's privilege of appearing before the Executive Office for Immigration Review or before the Service pursuant to 8 CFR part 3, subpart G.

Dated: May 21, 2002.

**John Ashcroft,**  
*Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 02-13264 Filed 5-24-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-30-P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2001-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-12761; AD 2002-10-15]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### **Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 875, 877, 884, 892, 892B, and 895 Series Turbofan Engines**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), that is applicable to Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 875, 877, 884, 892, 892B, and 895 series turbofan engines. This amendment requires reapplication of dry film lubricant to low pressure compressor (LPC) fan blade roots. This amendment is prompted by an aborted take-off resulting from LPC fan blade loss. Since this event, four additional cracked LPC fan blade roots have been reported. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent LPC fan blade loss, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and possible aircraft damage.

**DATES:** Effective date July 2, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Information regarding this action may be examined, by appointment, at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Keith Mead, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803-5299; telephone: (781) 238-7744, fax: (781) 238-7199.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that is applicable to Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 875, 877, 884, 892, 892B, and 895 series turbofan engines was published in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 2001 (66 FR 63341). That action proposed to require reapplication of dry film lubricant to low pressure compressor (LPC) fan blade roots.

#### **Comments**

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

#### **Wording Clarification**

One commenter suggests that the word "installation" in Table 1 of the compliance section, be replaced with the words "new or last lubrication." The commenter is concerned that the word "installation" does not ensure AD compliance at installation.

The FAA agrees. The wording in Table 1 has been changed because the suggested wording ensures that lubrication of the blade root is the proper criteria to use.

#### **Typographical Errors**

One commenter requests "LPT" be changed to correctly read "LPC" in Table 1, and "Dow Corning 321R (Rolls-Royce (RR) Omat item 4/52)" be changed to correctly read Dow Corning 321R (Rolls-Royce (RR) Omat item 4/51)" in paragraph (a).

The FAA agrees and has made these corrections in the final rule.

#### **Update Terminology**

One commenter suggests that the word "inspect" is not applicable in paragraph (b), and should be replaced with the word "lubricate." The AD is applicable to blade root lubrication.

The FAA agrees and has changed paragraph (b) in the final rule to state that on the effective date of the AD, blades with more cycles than the initial compliance criteria listed in Table 1 of this AD must be lubricated within 100 cycles-in-service after the effective date of this AD.

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 described previously. The FAA has determined that these changes will neither increase the economic burden on any operator nor increase the scope of the AD.

#### **Economic Analysis**

The FAA estimates that 100 engines installed on aircraft of U.S. registry would be affected by this AD. The FAA also estimates that it would take approximately 6 work hours per engine to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total labor cost of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$36,000 to accomplish each application of lubricant. The FAA estimates that operators will apply lubricant an average of 1.5 times per year, making the total annual cost of compliance with this AD \$54,000.

#### **Regulatory Analysis**

This final rule does not have federalism implications, as defined in Executive Order 13132, because it would not have a substantial direct effect 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. Accordingly, the FAA has not consulted with state authorities prior to publication of this final rule.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it 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.

**Adoption of the Amendment**

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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 adding a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

**2002–10–15 Rolls-Royce plc:** Amendment 39–12761. Docket No. 2001–NE–12–AD.

**Applicability**

This airworthiness directive (AD) is applicable to Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 875, 877, 884, 892, 892B, and 895 series turbofan engines with low pressure compressor (LPC) fan blade part numbers: FK 30838, FK30840, FK30842, FW12960, FW12961, FW12962, FW13175, or FW18548.

These engines are installed on, but not limited to Boeing 777 airplanes.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each engine identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For engines 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 (c) 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**

Compliance with this AD is required as indicated, unless already done.

To prevent LPC fan blade loss, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and possible aircraft damage, do the following:

TABLE 1.7—INITIAL AND REPETITIVE APPLICATION THRESHOLDS

LPC fan blade part Nos.	Initial compliance criteria	Repetitive compliance criteria
FK30842, FK30840, and FK30838 .....	Before achieving 600 cycles-since-new or -last application.	Repeat at intervals not exceeding 600 cycles-since-last compliance
FW12961, FW12960, FW12962, FW13175, and FW18548.	Before achieving 1,200 cycles-since-new or -last application.	Repeat at intervals not exceeding 1,200 cycles-since-last compliance.

(a) Apply an approved dry film lubricant to LPC fan blade roots as specified in Table 1 above. Aircraft Maintenance Manual task 72–31–11–300–801–R00 (Repair Scheme FRS A031 by air spray method only) or Engine Manual task 72–31–11–R001 (Repair Scheme FRS A028) contain procedures for renewing the dry film lubricant on the blade roots. For purposes of this AD, approved lubricants are Dow Corning 321R (Rolls-Royce (RR) Omat item 4/51), Rocol Dry Moly Spray (RR Omat item 4/52), Molydag 709 (RR Omat item 444), or PL.237/R1 (RR Omat item 4/43).

**Fan Blades Exceeding Initial Application Thresholds**

(b) On the effective date of the AD, blades with more cycles than the initial compliance criteria listed in Table 1 of this AD must be lubricated within 100 cycles-in-service after the effective date of this AD.

**Alternative Methods of Compliance**

(c) 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, Engine Certification Office (ECO). Operators must submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, ECO.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the ECO.

**Special Flight Permits**

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be done.

**Note 3:** The subject of this AD is addressed in Civil Aviation Authority Airworthiness Directive 001–03–2001, dated March 2, 2001.

**Effective Date**

(e) This amendment becomes effective on July 2, 2002.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on May 16, 2002.

**Peter A. White,**

*Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
[FR Doc. 02–13185 Filed 5–24–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–U**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 2002–NE–07–AD; Amendment 39–12760; AD 2002–10–14]

**RIN 2120–AA64**

**Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier-Rotax GmbH 914 F Series Reciprocating Engines**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Bombardier-Rotax GmbH 914 F series reciprocating engines. This action requires initial and repetitive inspections of certain exhaust bend assemblies, which are located between the cylinder heads and exhaust manifold assembly. This amendment is prompted by reports of cracks found in exhaust bend assemblies. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent carbon monoxide from entering the cabin and also to prevent the possibility of an engine fire.