be treated as an in-kind contribution because when aggregated with the earlier $1,000 contribution, it does not exceed the State party committee's $5,000 contribution limit under 11 CFR 110.2.

Certification of No Effect Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b)

[Regulatory Flexibility Act]

The attached final rules do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The basis for this certification is that few, if any, small entities are affected by these rules, which apply only to committees of political parties and other party organizations. National, State and many local party committees of the two major political parties and other political committees and organizations are not small entities under 5 U.S.C. 601 because they are not small businesses, small organizations, or small governmental jurisdictions. The final rules simplify the determination as to the amount of a party committee disbursement that must be attributed to a clearly identified Federal candidate in the case of certain telephone bank communications and clarify what funding is permissible. Any increase in the cost of compliance that might result from these proposed rules would not be in an amount sufficient to cause a significant economic impact.

List of Subjects in 11 CFR Part 106

Campaign funds, political committees and parties, political candidates.

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Federal Election Commission amends subchapter A of chapter 1 of title 11 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* as follows:

PART 106—ALLOCATIONS OF CANDIDATE AND COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 106 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 2 U.S.C. 438(a)(8), 441a(b), 441a(g).

■ 2. New section 106.8 is added to read as follows:

§ 106.8 Allocation of expenses for political party committee phone banks that refer to a clearly identified Federal candidate.

(a) *Scope.* This section applies to the costs of a phone bank conducted by a national, State, district, or local committee or organization of a political party where—

(1) The communication refers to a clearly identified Federal candidate;

(2) The communication does not refer to any other clearly identified Federal or non-Federal candidate;

(3) The communication includes another reference that generically refers to other candidates of the Federal candidate's party without clearly identifying them;

(4) The communication does not solicit a contribution, donation, or any other funds from any person; and

(5) The phone bank is not exempt from the definition of ''contribution'' under 11 CFR 100.89 and is not exempt from the definition of ''expenditure'' under 11 CFR 100.149.

(b) *Attribution.* Each disbursement for the costs of a phone bank described in paragraph (a) of this section shall be attributed as follows:

(1) Fifty percent of the disbursement is not attributable to any other Federal or non-Federal candidate, but must be paid for entirely with Federal funds; and

(2) Fifty percent of the disbursement is attributed to the clearly identified Federal candidate and must be paid for entirely with Federal funds. This disbursement may be one or a combination of the following:

(i) An in-kind contribution, subject to the limitations set forth in 11 CFR 110.1 or 110.2; or

(ii) A coordinated expenditure or an independent expenditure, subject to the limitations, restrictions, and requirements of 11 CFR 109.10, 109.32, 109.33 and 109.35; or

(iii) Reimbursed by the clearly identified Federal candidate or his or her authorized committee.

Dated: November 7, 2003.

Bradley A. Smith,

Vice Chairman, Federal Election Commission.

[FR Doc. 03–28472 Filed 11–13–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6715–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. CE200, Special Condition 23–140–SC]

Special Conditions: Honeywell, Inc., Pilatus PC–12/45; Protection of Systems for High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: These special conditions are issued to Honeywell, Inc., 23500 W. 105th Street, Olathe, KS 66061, for a supplemental type certificate for the Pilatus PC–12/45 airplane. This airplane will have novel and unusual design features when compared to the state of technology envisaged in the applicable airworthiness standards. These novel and unusual design features include the installation of two electronic barometric altimeters, Model AM–250, manufactured by Honeywell for which the applicable regulations do not contain adequate or appropriate airworthiness standards for the protection of these systems from the effects of high intensity radiated fields (HIRF). These special conditions contain the additional safety standards that the Administrator considers necessary to establish a level of safety equivalent to the airworthiness standards applicable to these airplanes.

DATES: The effective date of these special conditions is October 31, 2003. Comments must be received on or before December 15, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE–7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. CE200, Room 506, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. CE200. Comments may be inspected in the Rules Docket weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wes Ryan, Aerospace Engineer, Standards Office (ACE–110), Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone (816) 329–4123.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA has determined that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable because these procedures would significantly delay issuance of the approval design and thus delivery of the affected aircraft. In addition, the substance of these special conditions has been subject to the public comment process in several prior instances with no substantive comments received. The FAA, therefore, finds that good cause exists for making these special conditions effective upon issuance.

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to submit such written data, views, or arguments, as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket or notice number and be submitted in duplicate to the address

specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the Administrator. The special conditions may be changed in light of the comments received. All comments received will be available in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons, both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerning this rulemaking will be filed in the docket. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. CE200.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On March 04, 2003, Honeywell, Inc. made an application to the FAA for a new supplemental type certificate for the Pilatus PC–12/45 airplane. The PC–12/45 is currently approved under TC No. A78EU. The proposed modification incorporates a novel or unusual design feature, such as digital avionics consisting of digital barometric altimeters that are vulnerable to HIRF external to the airplane.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR part 21, § 21.101, Honeywell, Inc. must show that the Pilatus PC–12/45 aircraft meets the following provisions, or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change to the Pilatus PC–12/45: 14 CFR, part 21, §§ 21.29, 21.183(c) and 14 CFR part 23, Normal Category, effective February 4, 1991, including Amendments 23–1 through 23–42 and § 23.1305c(3) of Amendment 23–43 and § 23.1507 of Amendment 23–45 and §§ 23.49(c) and 23.562(d) of Amendment 23–44; § 23.479 paragraphs (b) and (c) of Amendment 23–45, Noise Certification—FAR 36 up to Amendment 10, as applicable. Fuel Venting Emissions—SFAR 27 up to Amendment 3, as applicable, and § 23.1301 of Amendment 23–20; §§ 23.1309, 23.1311, and 23.1321 of Amendment 23–49; and § 23.1322 of Amendment 23–43; exemptions, if any; and the special conditions adopted by this rulemaking action.

Discussion

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness standards do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards because of novel or unusual design features of an airplane, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of § 21.16.

Special conditions, as appropriate, as defined in § 11.19, are issued in accordance with § 11.38 after public notice and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.101.

Special conditions are initially applicable to the model for which they are issued. Should the applicant apply for a supplemental type certificate to modify any other model already included on the same type certificate to incorporate the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would also apply to the other model under the provisions of § 21.101.

Novel or Unusual Design Features

Honeywell, Inc. will incorporate the following novel and unusual design features:

Protection of Systems from High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF):

Recent advances in technology have given rise to the application in aircraft designs of advanced electrical and electronic systems that perform functions required for continued safe flight and landing. Due to the use of sensitive solid-state advanced components in analog and digital electronics circuits, these advanced systems are readily responsive to the transient effects of induced electrical current and voltage caused by the HIRF. The HIRF can degrade electronic systems performance by damaging components or upsetting system functions.

Furthermore, the HIRF environment has undergone a transformation that was not foreseen when the current requirements were developed. Higher energy levels are radiated from transmitters that are used for radar, radio, and television. Also, the number of transmitters has increased significantly. There is also uncertainty concerning the effectiveness of airframe shielding for HIRF. Furthermore, coupling to cockpit-installed equipment through the cockpit window apertures is undefined.

The combined effect of the technological advances in airplane design and the changing environment has resulted in an increased level of vulnerability of electrical and electronic systems required for the continued safe flight and landing of the airplane. Effective measures against the effects of exposure to HIRF must be provided by the design and installation of these systems. The accepted maximum energy levels in which civilian airplane system installations must be capable of operating safely are based on surveys and analysis of existing radio frequency emitters. These special conditions require that the airplane be evaluated under these energy levels for the protection of the electronic system and its associated wiring harness. These external threat levels, which are lower than previous required values, are believed to represent the worst case to which an airplane would be exposed in the operating environment.

These special conditions require qualification of systems that perform critical functions, as installed in aircraft, to the defined HIRF environment in paragraph 1 or, as an option to a fixed value using laboratory tests, in paragraph 2, as follows:

(1) The applicant may demonstrate that the operation and operational capability of the installed electrical and electronic systems that perform critical functions are not adversely affected when the aircraft is exposed to the HIRF environment defined below:

Frequency	Field strength (volts per meter)	
	Peak	Average
10 kHz–100 kHz	50	50
100 kHz–500 kHz	50	50
500 kHz–2 MHz	50	50
2 MHz–30 MHz	100	100
30 MHz–70 MHz	50	50
70 MHz–100 MHz	50	50
100 MHz–200 MHz	100	100
200 MHz–400 MHz	100	100
400 MHz–700 MHz	700	50
700 MHz–1 GHz	700	100
1 GHz–2 GHz	2000	200
2 GHz–4 GHz	3000	200
4 GHz–6 GHz	3000	200
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,

(2) The applicant may demonstrate by a system test and analysis that the electrical and electronic systems that perform critical functions can withstand a minimum threat of 100 volts per meter, electrical field strength, from 10 kHz to 18 GHz. When using this test to show compliance with the HIRF requirements, no credit is given for signal attenuation due to installation.

A preliminary hazard analysis must be performed by the applicant, for approval by the FAA, to identify either electrical or electronic systems that perform critical functions. The term ''critical'' means those functions whose failure would contribute to, or cause, a

failure condition that would prevent the continued safe flight and landing of the airplane. The systems identified by the hazard analysis that perform critical functions are candidates for the application of HIRF requirements. A system may perform both critical and non-critical functions. Primary electronic flight display systems, and their associated components, perform critical functions such as attitude, altitude, and airspeed indication. The HIRF requirements apply only to critical functions.

Compliance with HIRF requirements may be demonstrated by tests, analysis, models, similarity with existing systems, or any combination of these. Service experience alone is not acceptable since normal flight operations may not include an exposure to the HIRF environment. Reliance on a system with similar design features for redundancy as a means of protection against the effects of external HIRF is generally insufficient since all elements of a redundant system are likely to be exposed to the fields concurrently.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the Pilatus PC–12/45 airplane. Should Honeywell, Inc. apply at a later date for a supplemental type certificate to modify any other model on the same type certificate 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.

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on one model of airplane. 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.

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 herein. 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. 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 23

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Signs and symbols.

Citation

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113 and 44701; 14 CFR 21.16 and 21.101; and 14 CFR 11.38 and 11.19.

The Special Conditions

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the following special conditions are issued as part of the type certification basis for the Pilatus PC–12/45 airplane modified by Honeywell, Inc. to add digital barometric altimeters.

1. Protection of Electrical and Electronic Systems from High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF). Each system that performs critical functions must be designed and installed to ensure that the operations, and operational capabilities 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 Kansas City, Missouri, on October 31, 2003.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03–28530 Filed 11–13–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2003–15849; Airspace Docket No. 03–ASO–15]

Amendment of Class E Airspace; Rocky Mount, NC

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action amends Class E5 airspace at Rocky Mount, NC. An Area Navigation (RNAV) Global Positioning System (GPS) Standard Instrument Approach Procedure (SIAP), helicopter point in space approach, has been developed for Nash General Hospital, Rocky Mount, NC. As a result, controlled airspace extending upward from 700 feet Above Ground Level (AGL) is needed to contain the SIAP.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC February 19, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Walter R. Cochran, Manager, Airspace Branch, Air Traffic Division, Federal Aviation Administration, P.O. Box 20-636, Atlanta, Georgia 30320; telephone (404) 305–5586.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On August 20, 2003, the FAA proposed to amend part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) by amending Class E5 airspace at Rocky Mount, NC, (68 FR 50083). This action provides adequate Class E5 airspace for IFR operations at Nash General Hospital, Rocky Mount, NC. Designations for Class E are published in FAA Order 7400.9L, dated September 2, 2003, and effective September 16, 2003, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR part 71.1. The Class E designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments objecting to the proposal were received.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) amends Class E5 airspace at Rocky Mount, NC.

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore, (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) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.