Frequency	Field Strength (volts per meter)	
	Peak	Average
6 GHz–8 GHz	1000	200
8 GHz–12 GHz	3000	300
12 GHz–18 GHz	2000	200
18 GHz–40 GHz	600	200

The field strengths are expressed in terms of peak root-mean-square (rms) values.

Or

b. The applicant may demonstrate by a system laboratory test that the electrical and electronic systems that perform critical functions withstand an electromagnetic field strength of 100 volts per meter, without the benefit of airplane structural shielding, over a frequency range of 10 kHz to 18 GHz.

Note: The field strength values for the HIRF environment and laboratory test levels are expressed in root-mean-square units measured during the peak of the modulation cycle, as many laboratory instruments indicate amplitude. These are commonly called ''peak-rms'' values. The true peak field strength values will be higher by a factor of the square root of two.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the Boeing Model 707–353B (USAF C–137) airplanes modified to include the upgraded INS. Should Boeing Commercial Airplane Group apply at a later date for a design change approval to the type certificate to include any other model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, these special conditions would apply to that model as well, under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.101(a)(1).

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on the Boeing 707–353B (USAF C–137) airplanes. It is not a rule of general applicability and affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on the airplane.

Further, the substance of these special conditions has been subjected to the notice and comment period in several prior instances and has been derived without substantive change from those previously issued. It is unlikely that prior public comment would result in a significant change from the substance contained in this document. For this reason, and because a delay would significantly affect the certification of the airplane, which is imminent, the FAA has determined that prior public notice and comment are unnecessary and impracticable, and good cause exists for adopting these special conditions upon issuance. However, the FAA is requesting comments to allow interested persons to submit views that may not have been submitted in response to the prior opportunities for comment described above.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 25

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

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

The Special Conditions

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the following special conditions are issued as part of the supplemental type certification basis for the Boeing Model 707–353B (USAF C–137) airplanes.

1. *Protection of Electrical and Electronic Systems from Unwanted Effects of High-Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF).* Each electrical and electronic system that performs critical functions must be designed and installed to ensure that the operations and operational capability of these systems to perform critical functions are not adversely affected when the airplane is exposed to high-intensity radiated electromagnetic fields external to the airplane.

2. For the purpose of these special conditions, the following definition applies:

Critical Functions: Functions whose failure would contribute to or cause a failure condition that would prevent the continued safe flight and landing of the airplane.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 13, 1999.

Donald L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–18566 Filed 7–20–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99–CE–05–AD; Amendment 39–11226; AD 99–15–07]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; deHavilland Inc. Models DHC–2 Mk. I, DHC–2 Mk. II, and DHC–2 Mk. III Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to all deHavilland Inc. (deHavilland) Models DHC–2 Mk. I, DHC–2 Mk. II, and DHC–2 Mk. III airplanes. This AD requires repetitively inspecting the rear fuselage bulkhead at Station 228 for cracks. This AD also requires repairing any crack found or replacing any cracked rear fuselage bulkhead in accordance with a repair or replacement scheme obtained from the manufacturer through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). This AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Canada. The actions specified by this AD are intended to detect and correct cracking of the rear fuselage bulkhead at Station 228, which could result in structural damage of the fuselage to the point of failure with consequent loss of airplane control.

DATES: Effective September 10, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of September 10, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from Bombardier Inc., Bombardier Regional Aircraft Division, Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3K 1Y5; telephone: (416) 633–7310. This information may also be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules

Docket No. 99–CE–05–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. James Delisio, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581–1200; telephone: (516) 256–7521; facsimile: (516) 568–2716.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Events Leading to the Issuance of This AD

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to all deHavilland Models DHC–2 Mk. I, DHC–2 Mk. II, and DHC–2 Mk. III airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on April 23, 1999 (64 FR 19932). The NPRM proposed to require repetitively inspecting the rear fuselage bulkhead at Station 228 for cracks. Accomplishment of the proposed repetitive inspections as specified in the NPRM would be required in accordance with deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin 2/52, dated August 30, 1998, and deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin TB/60, dated August 30, 1998. The NPRM also proposed to require repairing any crack found or replacing any cracked rear fuselage bulkhead. Accomplishment of the proposed repair or replacement as specified in the NPRM would be required in accordance with a repair or replacement scheme obtained from the manufacturer through the FAA.

The NPRM was the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Canada.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were received on the proposed rule or the FAA's determination of the cost to the public.

The FAA's Determination

After careful review of all available information related to the subject presented above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed except for minor editorial corrections. The FAA has determined that these minor corrections will not change the meaning of the AD and will not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed.

Compliance Time of This AD

The compliance time of this AD is presented in both calendar time and hours time-in-service (TIS). While cracks are generally a result of classic fatigue (i.e., aging and cyclic operation), the FAA believes that cracks could develop over time regardless of how often the airplane is operated. In order to assure that rear fuselage bulkhead cracking does not go undetected, a compliance time of specific hours TIS and calendar time (whichever occurs first) is utilized.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 350 airplanes in the U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 1 workhour per airplane to accomplish the initial inspection, and that the average labor rate is approximately $60 an hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the initial inspection on U.S. operators is estimated to be $21,000, or $60 per airplane.

These figures only take into the account the costs of the initial inspection and do not take into account the costs of the repetitive inspections or the cost of any repair or replacement necessary if any rear fuselage bulkhead is found cracked. The FAA has no way of determining the number of repetitive inspections each owner/operator will incur over the life of his/her affected airplane or the number of airplanes that will have a cracked rear fuselage bulkhead and need repair or replacement.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

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 DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) 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 copy of the final evaluation prepared for this action 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, Incorporation by reference, 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 (AD) to read as follows:

99–15–07 DeHavilland Inc.: Amendment 39–11226; Docket No. 99–CE–05–AD.

Applicability: Models DHC–2 Mk. I, DHC–2 Mk. II, and DHC–2 Mk. III airplanes, all serial numbers, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane 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 airplanes 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 (d) 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: Required as indicated in the body of this AD, unless already accomplished.

To detect and correct cracking of the rear fuselage bulkhead at Station 228, which could result in structural damage of the fuselage to the point of failure with consequent loss of airplane control, accomplish the following:

(a) Within the next 400 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD or within the next 12 calendar months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 2,000 hours TIS or 5 years, whichever occurs first, inspect the rear fuselage bulkhead at Station 228 for cracks. Inspect in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions section of whichever of the following service bulletins that is applicable:

(1) *For the Models DHC–2 Mk. I and DHC–2 Mk. II airplanes:* deHavilland Beaver

Service Bulletin 2/52, dated August 30, 1998; or

(2) *For the Model DHC–2 Mk. III airplanes:* deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin TB/60, dated August 30, 1998.

(b) If any crack(s) is/are found in the rear fuselage bulkhead at Station 228 during any inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish the following:

(1) Obtain a repair or replacement scheme from the manufacturer through the FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581–1200; facsimile: (516) 568–2716.

(2) Incorporate this repair or replacement scheme.

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the initial or repetitive compliance times that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, New York ACO, 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581–1200. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the New York ACO.

(e) Questions or technical information related to deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin TB/60, dated August 30, 1998, and deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin 2/52, dated August 30, 1998, should be directed to Bombardier Inc., Bombardier Regional Aircraft Division, Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3K 1Y5; telephone: (416) 633–7310. This service information may be examined at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

(f) The inspections required by this AD shall be done in accordance with deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin TB/60, dated August 30, 1998, or deHavilland Beaver Service Bulletin 2/52, dated August 30, 1998. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Bombardier Inc., Bombardier Regional Aircraft Division, Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3K 1Y5. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri, or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, suite 700, Washington, DC.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in Canadian AD No. CF–98–38, dated October 15, 1998.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on September 10, 1999.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on July 12, 1999.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–18197 Filed 7–20–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–247–AD; Amendment 39–11227; AD 99–15–08]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–200 and –300 Series Airplanes Equipped With General Electric CF6–80C2 Series Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 747–200 and –300 series airplanes, that currently requires various inspections and functional tests to detect discrepancies of the thrust reverser control and indication system, and correction of any discrepancy found. This amendment reduces the repetitive interval for one certain functional test. This amendment is prompted by reports indicating that several center drive units (CDU) were returned to the manufacturer of the CDU's because of low holding torque of the CDU cone brake. The actions specified by this AD are intended to ensure the integrity of the fail safe features of the thrust reverser system by preventing possible failure modes in the thrust reverser control system that can result in inadvertent deployment of a thrust reverser during flight.

DATES: Effective August 25, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of Boeing Service Bulletin 747–78A2166, Revision 1, dated October 9, 1997, as listed in the regulations, is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of August 25, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–78A2130, dated May 26, 1994, was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register as of April 13, 1995 (60 FR 13623, March 14, 1995).

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Holly Thorson, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANM–140S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–1357; fax (425) 227–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) by superseding AD 95–06–01, amendment 39–9171 (60 FR 13623, March 14, 1995), which is applicable to certain Boeing Model 747–200 and –300 series airplanes, was published in the **Federal Register** on January 21, 1999 (64 FR 3226). The action proposed to continue to require various inspections and functional tests to detect discrepancies of the thrust reverser control and indication system, and correction of any discrepancy found. The action also proposed to reduce the repetitive interval for one certain functional test.

Comments

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

The commenter supports the proposed rule.

Explanation of Change to the Final Rule

In the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), the FAA proposed to require repetitive functional tests of the CDU cone brake on Model 747–200 and –300 series airplanes, at intervals not to exceed 650 hours time-in-service, regardless of whether the airplane is equipped with thrust reversers modified in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 747–78–2144. Since the issuance of the NPRM, the FAA has determined that a repetitive interval of 1,000 hours time-in-service would adequately ensure safety on airplanes equipped with thrust reversers modified in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 747–78–2144, Revision 1, dated April 11, 1996. This decision is based on the FAA's determination that frequent maintenance on such systems as the thrust reverser system could increase the risk of maintenance errors. Also, Boeing Service Bulletin 747–78–