endanger the livestock or poultry of this Administrator, such products may

fever, if in the opinion of the

influenza, swine vesicular disease,

including but not limited to foot-and-

known to have exotic diseases,

§ 104.2 Permit authorized.

■ BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS

PART 104—PERMITS FOR COMMUNICATION PRODUCTS

■ 2.80, and 371.4.

■ revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

■ * * * * *

■ e. In paragraph (c)(1)(iii), by removing the word “rinderpest;”;

■ f. In paragraphs (c)(1)(iv) and (c)(5) and (6), by removing the words “rinderpest or”;

■ g. In paragraph (c)(7), by removing the word “rinderpest.”

The revision reads as follows:

§ 98.34 Import permits for poultry semen and animal semen.

* * * * *

(i) The donor animal shall have been inspected on the farm of origin or on another premises (the inspection may be on another premises only if a veterinarian of the Department has traced the donor animal back to its farm of origin) by a veterinarian of the United States Department of Agriculture who, in cooperation with the veterinary service of the region of origin of the donor animal, shall have determined, insofar as possible, that the donor animal was never infected with foot-and-mouth disease; that the donor animal was never on a farm or other premises where foot-and-mouth disease then existed; that the donor animal has not been on a premises that had an animal that was susceptible to the virus of foot-and-mouth disease and that was exposed to the disease during the 12 months immediately prior to the date of inspection of the donor animal; that the donor animal, if a swine, has never been vaccinated against foot-and-mouth disease; and that the donor animal was free from evidence of other communicable disease;

* * * * *

PART 104—PERMITS FOR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS

■ 47. The authority for part 104 continues to read as follows:


■ 48. Section 104.2 is amended by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 104.2 Permit authorized.

* * * * *

(b) A permit shall not be issued for a biological product from countries known to have exotic diseases, including but not limited to foot-and-mouth disease, highly pathogenic avian influenza, swine vesicular disease, Newcastle disease, and African swine fever, if in the opinion of the Administrator, such products may endanger the livestock or poultry of this country.

* * * * *

Done in Washington, DC, this 4th day of April 2018.

Kevin Shea, 
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2018–07232 Filed 4–10–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39


RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Model A109E, A109K2, A100S, AW109SP, A119, and AW119 MKII helicopters. This AD reduces the life limit of and requires inspecting a tail rotor blade retention bolt (bolt). This AD is prompted by the discovery of a cracked bolt. The actions of this AD are intended to address an unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD becomes effective April 26, 2018.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of certain documents listed in this AD as of April 26, 2018.

We must receive comments on this AD by June 11, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Docket: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for sending your comments electronically.

• Fax: 202–493–2251.

• Mail: Send comments to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

• Hand Delivery: Deliver to the “Mail” address between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Examining the AD Docket
You may examine the AD docket on the internet at http://

www.regulations.gov by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2018–0170; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD, any incorporated-by-reference service information, the economic evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for Docket Operations (telephone 800–647–5527) is in the ADDRESSES section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matt Fuller, Senior Aviation Safety Engineer, Safety Management Section, Rotorcraft Standards Branch, FAA, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Fort Worth, TX 76177; telephone (817) 222–5110; email matthew.fuller@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

This AD is a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety, and we did not provide you with notice and an opportunity to provide your comments prior to it becoming effective. However, we invite you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written comments, data, or views. We also invite comments relating to the economic, environmental, energy, or federalism impacts that resulted from adopting this AD. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the AD, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. To ensure the docket does not contain duplicate comments, commenters should send only one copy of written comments, or if comments are filed electronically, commenters should submit them only one time. We will file in the docket all comments that we receive, as well as a report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerning this
rulemaking during the comment period. We will consider all the comments we receive and may conduct additional rulemaking based on those comments.

Discussion

EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union, has issued Emergency AD No. 2016–0173–E, dated August 24, 2016, to correct an unsafe condition for Leonardo S.p.A. (formerly Agusta) Model A109E, A109K2, A109LUH, A109S, A119, AW109SP, and AW119MKII helicopters. EASA advises of a crack found in a bolt, part number (P/N) 709–0160–57–101, during a pre-flight inspection of a Model A109E helicopter. This part-numbered bolt is also installed on Model A109K2, A109LUH, A109S, A119, AW109SP, and AW119MKII helicopters. Subsequent investigation did not identify the cause of the crack. EASA advises that this condition, if not detected and corrected, could lead to failure of the tail rotor, possibly resulting in loss of control of the helicopter. As a precautionary measure pending the completion of the investigation and to address the unsafe condition, the EASA AD requires reducing the life limit of and repetitively inspecting the bolts. The EASA AD is considered an interim action and further AD action may follow.

Accordingly, this AD requires reducing the life limit of bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 to 800 hours time-in-service (TIS) or 3,200 landings, depending on the model helicopter on which the bolt is installed. This AD also requires, within 25 hours TIS, inspecting each bolt for a crack using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, both before and after cleaning and degreasing the bolts. Additional inspections of the bolts at longer intervals may also be necessary. We plan to publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to give the public an opportunity to comment on those long-term requirements.

The FAA is in the process of updating Agusta’s name change to Leonardo Helicopters on its FAA type certificate. Because this name change is not yet effective, this AD specifies Agusta.

FAA’s Determination

These helicopters have been approved by the aviation authority of Italy and are approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with Italy, EASA, its technical representative, has notified us of the unsafe condition described in the EASA AD. We are issuing this AD because we evaluated all information provided by EASA and determined the unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other helicopters of these same type designs.

Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51


This service information is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the ADRESSES section.

AD Requirements

This AD requires, before further flight, removing from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 that has reached or exceeded its new life limit. Thereafter, this AD requires removing from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 before it reaches its new life limit.

This AD also requires, within 25 hours time-in-service, inspecting each bolt for a crack using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, both before and after cleaning and degreasing the bolts, and replacing a cracked bolt before further flight.

Differences Between This AD and the EASA AD

The EASA AD applies to Model A109LUH helicopters. This AD does not because the Model A109LUH does not have an FAA type certificate. The EASA AD does not specify life limits for bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 that has been interchanged between model helicopter installations, while this AD does. The EASA AD requires repeating the visual inspection every 200 hours, while this AD does not, as this time interval would allow for sufficient time for notice and comment.

Impriv Action

We consider this AD to be an interim action. The design approval holder is currently developing a modification that will address the unsafe condition identified in this AD. Once this modification is developed, approved, and available, we might consider additional rulemaking.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this AD affects 234 helicopters of U.S. Registry. We estimate that operators may incur the following costs in order to comply with this AD. Labor costs are estimated at $85 per work-hour.

Removing a bolt that has reached its new life limit will take about 2 work-hours for a cost of $170 per bolt. Inspecting the bolts will take about 4 work-hours for an estimated cost of $340 per helicopter and $79,560 for the U.S. fleet. Replacing a bolt will take negligible additional labor time and parts will cost about $500.

According to Leonardo Helicopter’s service information, some of the costs of this AD may be covered under warranty, thereby reducing the cost impact on affected individuals. We do not control warranty coverage by Leonardo Helicopter. Accordingly, we have included all costs in our cost estimate.

FAA’s Justification and Determination of the Effective Date

An unsafe condition exists that requires the immediate adoption of this AD without providing an opportunity for public comments prior to adoption. The FAA has found that the risk to the flying public justifies waiving notice and comment prior to adoption of this rule because some of the required corrective actions must be completed before further flight. Therefore, we find good cause that notice and opportunity for prior public comment are impracticable.

In addition, for the reasons stated above, we find that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA’s authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. “Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs,” describes in more detail the scope of the Agency’s authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in “Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.” Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition...
that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will 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.

For the reasons discussed, I certify that this AD:
1. Is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866;
2. Is not a “significant rule” under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979);
3. Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska to the extent that it justifies making a regulatory distinction; and
4. 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.

We prepared an economic evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this AD and placed it in the AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39
Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):


(a) Applicability


(b) Unsafe Condition

This AD defines the unsafe condition as a crack in a bolt. This condition could result in failure of the tail rotor and loss of control of the helicopter.

(c) Effective Date

This AD becomes effective April 26, 2018.

(d) Compliance

You are responsible for performing each action required by this AD within the specified compliance time unless it has already been accomplished prior to that time.

(e) Required Actions

(1) Before further flight:

(i) For Model A109E and A109K2 helicopters, remove from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 that has 800 or more hours time-in-service (TIS). If the bolt TIS is unknown, remove the bolt from service. Thereafter, remove from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 before accumulating 800 hours TIS.

(ii) For Model A109S, AW109SP, A119, and AW119 MKII helicopters, remove from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 that has 3,200 or more landings. If the number of landings is unknown, remove the bolt from service. Thereafter, remove from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 before accumulating 3,200 landings. For purposes of this AD, a landing is counted anytime a helicopter lifts off into the air and then lands again regardless of the duration of the landing and regardless of whether the engine is shutdown.

(iii) Remove from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 that has been interchanged between different model helicopters listed in paragraphs (e)(1)(i) and (e)(1)(ii) of this AD that has 800 or more hours TIS or 3,200 or more landings. If the hours TIS or number of landings is unknown, remove the bolt from service. Thereafter, remove from service any bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101 that has been interchanged between different model helicopters listed in paragraphs (e)(1)(i) and (e)(1)(ii) of this AD before accumulating 800 hours TIS or 3,200 landings, whichever occurs first.

(2) Within 25 hours TIS, remove each bolt P/N 709–0160–57–101. Prior to cleaning, using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, visually inspect the bolt for a crack in the area depicted in Figure 1 of Leonardo Helicopters Mandatory Bollettino Tecnico Nos. 109EP–149, 109K–72, 109S–072, 109SP–105, or 119–080, all dated August 19, 2016.

(i) Prior to cleaning, using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, visually inspect the bolt for a crack in the area depicted in Figure 1 of Leonardo Helicopters Mandatory Bollettino Tecnico Nos. 109EP–149, 109K–72, 109S–072, 109SP–105, or 119–080, all dated August 19, 2016.

(ii) Prior to cleaning, using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, visually inspect the bolt for a crack in the area depicted in Figure 1 of Leonardo Helicopters Mandatory Bollettino Tecnico Nos. 109EP–149, 109K–72, 109S–072, 109SP–105, or 119–080, all dated August 19, 2016.

(iii) Prior to cleaning, using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, visually inspect the bolt for a crack in the area depicted in Figure 1 of Leonardo Helicopters Mandatory Bollettino Tecnico Nos. 109EP–149, 109K–72, 109S–072, 109SP–105, or 119–080, all dated August 19, 2016.

(iv) Prior to cleaning, using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, visually inspect the bolt for a crack in the area depicted in Figure 1 of Leonardo Helicopters Mandatory Bollettino Tecnico Nos. 109EP–149, 109K–72, 109S–072, 109SP–105, or 119–080, all dated August 19, 2016.

(v) Prior to cleaning, using a 10X or higher power magnifying glass, visually inspect the bolt for a crack in the area depicted in Figure 1 of Leonardo Helicopters Mandatory Bollettino Tecnico Nos. 109EP–149, 109K–72, 109S–072, 109SP–105, or 119–080, all dated August 19, 2016.


(4) You may view this service information at FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Room 6N–321, Fort Worth, TX 76177. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (817) 222–5110.

(5) You may view this service information that is incorporated by reference at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call (202) 741–6030, or go to: http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.
Georgia was designated as a customs port of entry by the President’s message of March 3, 1913, concerning the reorganization of the U.S. Customs Service pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 434; 19 U.S.C. 1). Executive Order 8367, dated March 5, 1940, established specific geographical boundaries for the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia.

In the July 2017 NPRM, CBP proposed to amend the geographical limits of the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia because the current boundaries established by the Executive Order do not include a large portion of Savannah-Hilton Head International Airport, including the site of a proposed replacement Federal Inspection Service facility for arriving international travelers, or distribution centers and cold storage agricultural facilities that support the seaport. Also, most of the projected facilities, such as a new ship terminal with two berths for container ships and bonded warehouses, which will be built on the region’s remaining undeveloped properties will be outside of the boundaries of the current port of entry. CBP determined that the extension of the boundaries would not result in a change in the service that is provided to the public by the port and would not require a change in the staffing or workload at the port. For the proposed rule, CBP posted on the docket on http://www.regulations.gov a map of the Savannah area with the current port limits marked by blue lines and the proposed port limits marked by red lines.

The NPRM solicited public comment on the proposed rulemaking. The public comment period closed on September 1, 2017.

Discussion of Comments

One commenter responded to the solicitation of comments to the proposed rule. A description of the comment received, together with CBP’s analysis, is set forth below.

Comment:

The commenter fully supported the expansion of the port limits, but was concerned that the proposed limits did not take into consideration the warehouses and distribution centers being built to accommodate the current volume of trade. The commenter suggested that the western portion of the boundary line be extended to the county line (west of Interstate Highway 95) to support the future growth of the area, provide jobs and further solidify Savannah’s position in international trade.

CBP Response:

CBP agrees with the commenter’s suggestion to extend the western portion of the boundary line as the purpose of expanding the port of entry of Savannah is to provide better services to the carriers, importers and the general public. In addition, CBP has become aware that import facilities are just outside of Chatham County. Thus, CBP is extending the western boundary slightly into Effingham County to include those facilities. The further extension of the port would not require a change in staffing or workload at the port.

Conclusion

After review of the comment, CBP has determined to further expand the boundaries of the Savannah port of entry in this final rule. Instead of the western boundaries being along the Federal Interstate Highway 95, they begin where Highway 204 (Fort Argyle Road) intersects with Federal Interstate Highway 95, then proceed north to the intersection with Old River Road, then north along Old River Road until it intersects with Federal Interstate Highway 16, then east along Federal Interstate Highway 16 until it meets the Chatham County line, and then north along the Chatham County line until it meets the intersection with Federal Interstate Highway 95 and the Georgia-South Carolina state line. The new port limits are described below, and the map posted on the docket on http://www.regulations.gov shows the new port limits as expanded by this final rule marked by the blue and black lines.

Port Description of Savannah, Georgia

The final port limits of the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia, are as follows: From 32°14.588' N–081°08.455' W (where Federal Interstate Highway 95 crosses the Georgia-South Carolina state line) and extending in a straight line to 32°04.903' N–080°54.998' W (where Walls Cut meets Wright River and Turtle Island); then proceeding in a straight line to 31°52.651' N–081°03.331' W (where Adams Creek meets Green Island Sound); then proceeding northwest in a straight line to 32°00.280’ N–081°17.00’ W (where Highway 204 intersects Federal Interstate Highway 95); then proceeding northwest along Fort Argyle Road (Highway 204) to the intersection with Old River Road; then proceeding north on Old River Road to the intersection with Federal Interstate Highway 16; then proceeding southeast along Federal Interstate Highway 16 to the Chatham County line; then proceeding northeast and then east along the length of the Chatham County line until it intersects with Federal Interstate Highway 95 at Knoxboro.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

19 CFR Part 101

[Docket No. USCBP–2017–0017; CBP Dec. 18–03]

Extension of Port Limits of Savannah, GA


ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document adopts as a final rule, with changes, proposed amendments to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations pertaining to the expansion of the geographical limits of the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia. The port limits will be expanded to make the boundaries more easily identifiable to the public and to allow for uniform and continuous service to the extended area of Savannah, Georgia. This change is part of CBP’s continuing program to use its personnel, facilities, and resources more efficiently and to provide better service to carriers, importers, and the general public.

DATES: Effective Date: May 11, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Roger Kaplan, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, (202) 325–4543, or by email at Roger.Kaplan@dhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) published in the Federal Register (82 FR 30807) on July 3, 2017, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) proposed to amend §101.3(b)(1) of title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) to extend the geographical limits of the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia. The proposed boundaries of the port of entry included the majority of Chatham County, Georgia, as well as a small portion of Jasper County, South Carolina. As explained in the NPRM, Savannah, Georgia was designated as a customs port of entry by the President’s message of March 3, 1913, concerning the reorganization of the U.S. Customs Service pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 434; 19 U.S.C. 1). Executive Order 8367, dated March 5, 1940, established specific geographical boundaries for the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia.

In the July 2017 NPRM, CBP proposed to amend the geographical limits of the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia because the current boundaries established by the Executive Order do not include a large portion of Savannah-Hilton Head International Airport, including the site of a proposed replacement Federal Inspection Service facility for arriving international travelers, or distribution centers and cold storage agricultural facilities that support the seaport. Also, most of the projected facilities, such as a new ship terminal with two berths for container ships and bonded warehouses, which will be built on the region’s remaining undeveloped properties will be outside of the boundaries of the current port of entry. CBP determined that the extension of the boundaries would not result in a change in the service that is provided to the public by the port and would not require a change in the staffing or workload at the port. For the proposed rule, CBP posted on the docket on http://www.regulations.gov a map of the Savannah area with the current port limits marked by blue lines and the proposed port limits marked by red lines.

The NPRM solicited public comment on the proposed rulemaking. The public comment period closed on September 1, 2017.

One commenter responded to the solicitation of comments to the proposed rule. A description of the comment received, together with CBP’s analysis, is set forth below.

Comment:

The commenter fully supported the expansion of the port limits, but was concerned that the proposed limits did not take into consideration the warehouses and distribution centers being built to accommodate the current volume of trade. The commenter suggested that the western portion of the boundary line be extended to the county line (west of Interstate Highway 95) to support the future growth of the area, provide jobs and further solidify Savannah’s position in international trade.

CBP Response:

CBP agrees with the commenter’s suggestion to extend the western portion of the boundary line as the purpose of expanding the port of entry of Savannah is to provide better services to the carriers, importers and the general public. In addition, CBP has become aware that import facilities are just outside of Chatham County. Thus, CBP is extending the western boundary slightly into Effingham County to include those facilities. The further extension of the port would not require a change in staffing or workload at the port.

Conclusion

After review of the comment, CBP has determined to further expand the boundaries of the Savannah port of entry in this final rule. Instead of the western boundaries being along the Federal Interstate Highway 95, they begin where Highway 204 (Fort Argyle Road) intersects with Federal Interstate Highway 95, then proceed north to the intersection with Old River Road, then north along Old River Road until it intersects with Federal Interstate Highway 16, then east along Federal Interstate Highway 16 until it meets the Chatham County line, and then north along the Chatham County line until it meets the intersection with Federal Interstate Highway 95 and the Georgia-South Carolina state line. The new port limits are described below, and the map posted on the docket on http://www.regulations.gov shows the new port limits as expanded by this final rule marked by the blue and black lines.

Port Description of Savannah, Georgia

The final port limits of the port of entry of Savannah, Georgia, are as follows: From 32°14.588’ N–081°08.455’ W (where Federal Interstate Highway 95 crosses the Georgia-South Carolina state line) and extending in a straight line to 32°04.903’ N–080°54.998’ W (where Walls Cut meets Wright River and Turtle Island); then proceeding in a straight line to 31°52.651’ N–081°03.331’ W (where Adams Creek meets Green Island Sound); then proceeding northwest in a straight line to 32°00.280’ N–081°17.00’ W (where Highway 204 intersects Federal Interstate Highway 95); then proceeding northwest along Fort Argyle Road (Highway 204) to the intersection with Old River Road; then proceeding north on Old River Road to the intersection with Federal Interstate Highway 16; then proceeding southeast along Federal Interstate Highway 16 to the Chatham County line; then proceeding northeast and then east along the length of the Chatham County line until it intersects with Federal Interstate Highway 95 at Knoxboro.