to high intensity electromagnetic fields could affect the activation system.

The following proposed special conditions can be characterized as addressing either the safety performance of the system, or the system's integrity against inadvertent activation. Because a crash requiring use of the airbags is a relatively rare event, and because the consequences of an inadvertent activation are potentially quite severe, these latter requirements are probably the more rigorous from a design standpoint.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the Model 767–300 series airplanes. Should Am-Safe, Inc. apply at a later date for a supplemental type certificate to modify any other model included on Type Certificate No. A1NM to incorporate the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would apply to that model as well under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on the Boeing Model 767–300 series airplanes. It is not a rule of general applicability, and it affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on the airplane.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 25

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

The authority citation for these proposed special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701, 44702, 44704.

The Proposed Special Conditions

Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes the following special conditions as part of the type certification basis for the Boeing Model 767–300 series airplanes equipped with inflatable lapbelts modified by Am-Safe, Inc.

1. *Seats With Inflatable Lapbelts.* It must be shown that the inflatable lapbelt will deploy and provide protection under crash conditions where it is necessary to prevent serious head injury. The means of protection must take into consideration a range of stature from a two-year-old child to a ninety-nine percentile male. The inflatable lapbelt must provide a consistent level of energy absorption throughout that range. The following situations must be considered:

a. The seat occupant is holding an infant,

b. The seat occupant is a child in a child restraint device,

c. The seat occupant is a child not using a child restraint device.

2. The inflatable lapbelt must provide adequate protection for each occupant regardless of the number of occupants of the seat assembly, considering that unoccupied seats may have buckled (thereby active) seatbelts.

3. The design must prevent the inflatable lapbelt from being incorrectly buckled and/or incorrectly installed such that the airbag would not properly deploy. Alternatively, it must be shown that such deployment is not hazardous to the occupant, and will provide the required head injury protection.

4. It must be shown that the inflatable lapbelt system is not susceptible to inadvertent deployment as a result of wear and tear, or inertial loads resulting from in-flight or ground maneuvers (including gusts and hard landings), likely to be experienced in service.

5. The seated occupant must not be injured as a result of the inflatable lapbelt deployment.

6. It must be shown that the inflatable lapbelt will not be a hazard to an occupant who is in the brace position when it deploys.

7. It must be shown that an inadvertent deployment, that could cause injury to a standing or sitting person, is improbable.

8. It must be shown that inadvertent deployment of the inflatable lapbelt, during the most critical part of the flight, will either not cause a hazard to the airplane or is extremely improbable.

9. It must be shown that the inflatable lapbelt will not impede rapid egress of occupants 10 seconds after its deployment.

10. The system must be protected from lightning and HIRF. The threats specified in Special Condition No. 25–ANM–18 are incorporated by reference for the purpose of measuring lightning and HIRF protection. For the purposes of complying with HIRF requirements, the inflatable lapbelt system is considered a ''critical system'' if its deployment could have a hazardous effect on the airplane; otherwise it is considered an ''essential'' system.

11. The inflatable lapbelt must function properly after loss of normal aircraft electrical power, and after a transverse separation of the fuselage at the most critical location.

12. It must be shown that the inflatable lapbelt will not release hazardous quantities of gas or particulate matter into the cabin.

13. The inflatable lapbelt installation must be protected from the effects of fire such that no hazard to occupants will result.

14. There must be a means for a crewmember to verify the integrity of the inflatable lapbelt activation system prior to each flight or it must be demonstrated to reliably operate between inspection intervals.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 3, 1999.

Donald L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, ANM–100.

[FR Doc. 99–12057 Filed 5–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 192–0132b; FRL–6334–6]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revisions, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concern the recision of rules for the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District (TCAPCD). These rules concern emissions from orchard heaters and fuel burning equipment. The intended effect of this action is to bring the MDAQMD and TCAPCD SIPs up to date in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for this approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will not take effect and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period

on this rule. Any parties interested in commenting on this rule should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by June 14, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to: Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

Copies of the rules and EPA's evaluation report for the rules are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are also available for inspection at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Divison, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 ''L'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, 15428 Civic Drive, Suite 200, Victorville, CA 92392–2383.

Tehama County Air Pollution Control District, 1760 Walnut Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office, (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901, Telephone: (415) 744–1135.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The rules being proposed for recision from the MDAQMD portion of the California SIP are included in San Bernardino County Air Pollution Control District Regulation VI, Orchard, Field or Citrus Grove Heaters, consisting of Rule 100, Definitions; Rule 101, Exceptions; Rule 102, Permits Required; Rule 103, Transfer; Rule 104, Standards for Granting Permits; Rule 109, Denial of Application; Rule 110, Appeals; Rule 120, Fees; Rule 130, Classification of Orchard Heaters; Rule 131, Class I Heaters Designated; Rule 132, Class II Heaters Designated; Rule 133, Identification of Heaters; Rule 134, Use of Incomplete Heaters Prohibited; Rule 135, Cleaning, Repairs; Rule 136, Authority to Classify Orchard Heaters; and Rule 137, Enforcement. These rules recisions were adopted by the MDAQMD on June 24, 1996 and submitted by the California Air Resources Board to EPA on March 3, 1997.

The rule being proposed for recision from the TCAPCD portion of the California SIP is TCAPCD Rule 4.13, Fuel Burning Equipment . This rule recision was adopted by the TCAPCD on September 10, 1985 and submitted by the California Air Resources Board to EPA on February 10, 1986.

For further information, please see the information provided in the Direct Final action that is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: April 9, 1999.

David P. Howekamp,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 99–11826 Filed 5–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IA 069–1069b; FRL–6340–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Approval Under Section 112(l); State of Iowa

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the state of Iowa on December 11, 1998, and January 29, 1999. These revisions consist of updates to Iowa Administrative Code, Chapters 20, 22, 23, 25, and 28. These revisions will strengthen the SIP with respect to attainment and maintenance of established air quality standards and with respect to control of hazardous air pollutants. Approval of this SIP revision will make these rule revisions Federally enforceable.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revisions as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by June 14, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Wayne A. Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551–7603.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: April 28, 1999.

William Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VII.

[FR Doc. 99–11824 Filed 5–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MN58–01–7283; FRL–6342–6]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Minnesota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes to approve a revision to the Minnesota State Implementation Plan (SIP) for attainment and maintenance for the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for Carbon Monoxide (CO). The revision pertains to the Minneapolis/St. Paul CO nonattainment area which includes the following counties: Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, Washington, and Wright. The revision proposed for approval is the maintenance plan required pursuant to section 175A of the Clean Air Act (Act) for areas redesignated from nonattainment to attainment. Correspondingly, EPA is also proposing to approve the redesignation of the Minneapolis/St. Paul CO Area to attainment. EPA will not finalize this approval until the EPA approves the vehicle Inspection/Maintenance program for the Minneapolis/St. Paul area.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received by June 14, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (It is recommended that you telephone