

included on the same type certificate to incorporate the same novel or unusual design feature, these special conditions would also apply to the other model under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

#### Novel or Unusual Design Features

The modified McDonnell Douglas DC-9-30 series airplanes will incorporate an electronic attitude display system and an electronic air data system, which were not available at the time of certification of these airplanes, both of which perform critical functions. These systems may be vulnerable to HIRF external to the airplane.

#### Discussion

There is no specific regulation that addresses protection requirements for electrical and electronic systems from HIRF. Increased power levels from ground-based radio transmitters and the growing use of sensitive electrical and electronic systems to command and control airplanes have made it necessary to provide adequate protection.

To ensure that a level of safety is achieved equivalent to that intended by the regulations incorporated by reference, special conditions are needed for the McDonnell Douglas DC-9-30 series airplanes. These special conditions require that new electrical and electronic systems, such as the electronic attitude and air data display systems that perform critical functions, be designed and installed to preclude component damage and interruption of function due to both the direct and indirect effects of HIRF.

#### High-Intensity Radiated Fields

With the trend toward increased power levels from ground-based transmitters, plus the advent of space and satellite communications coupled with electronic command and control of the airplane, the immunity of critical digital avionics systems to HIRF must be established.

It is not possible to precisely define the HIRF to which the airplane will be exposed in service. There is also uncertainty concerning the effectiveness of airframe shielding for HIRF. Furthermore, coupling of electromagnetic energy to cockpit-installed equipment through the cockpit window apertures is undefined. Based on surveys and analysis of existing HIRF emitters, an adequate level of protection exists when compliance with the HIRF protection special condition is shown with either paragraph 1, OR 2 below:

1. A minimum threat of 100 volts rms per meter electric field strength from 10 KHz to 18 GHz.

a. The threat must be applied to the system elements and their associated wiring harnesses without the benefit of airframe shielding.

b. Demonstration of this level of protection is established through system tests and analysis.

2. A threat external to the airframe of the following field strengths for the frequency ranges indicated.

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 of the root-mean-square (rms) over the complete modulation period.

The threat levels identified above are the result of an FAA review of existing studies on the subject of HIRF in light of the ongoing work of the Electromagnetic Effects Harmonization Working Group of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

#### Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable initially to the McDonnell Douglas DC-9-30 series airplanes modified by LMAC. Should LMAC apply at a later date for a supplemental type certificate to modify any other model included on the same type certificate to incorporate the same novel or unusual design feature, these special conditions would apply to that model as well under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

#### Discussion of Comments

Notice of proposed special conditions No. 25-99-09-SC was published in the **Federal Register** on December 3, 1999 (64 FR 67804). One commenter responded, expressing support for the special conditions. The special conditions are therefore adopted as proposed.

#### Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on the

McDonnell Douglas DC-9-30 series airplanes modified by LMAC. 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

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 type certification basis for McDonnell Douglas DC-9-30 series airplanes modified by Lockheed Martin Aircraft Center.

1. *Protection 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 operation and operational capability of these systems to perform critical functions are not adversely affected when the airplane is exposed to high intensity radiated fields.

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 March 13, 2000.

**Donald L. Riggins,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-7495 Filed 3-24-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-NM-311-AD; Amendment 39-11649; AD 95-19-04 R1]

**RIN 2120-AA64**

**Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, 36A, 55, 55B, and 55C Airplanes**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; rescission.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment rescinds an existing Airworthiness Directive (AD), applicable to certain Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, 36A, 55, 55B, and 55C airplanes. That AD currently requires installation of a placard on the instrument panel in the cockpit to advise the flightcrew that the Omega navigation system may be inoperative at certain engine speeds. That AD also provides for an optional installation of certain band reject filters, which eliminates the need for the placard. The requirements of that AD were intended to prevent excessive deviation from the intended flight path due to loss of navigation signals, which could result in a potentially low-fuel condition or a traffic conflict. Since the issuance of that AD, use of the Omega navigation system has been permanently discontinued; therefore, the original unsafe condition no longer exists.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 27, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** C. Dale Bleakney, Aerospace Engineer, Flight Test Branch, ACE-117W, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946-4135; fax (316) 946-4407.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 5, 1995, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued AD 95-19-04, amendment 39-9365 (60 FR 47265, September 12, 1995), applicable to certain Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, 36A, 55, 55B, and 55C airplanes. That AD requires installation of a placard on the instrument panel in the cockpit to advise the flightcrew that the Omega navigation system may be inoperative at certain engine speeds. That AD also provides for an optional installation of certain band reject filters, which eliminates the need for the placard. That action was prompted by reports of loss of certain navigation signals during extended over-water operation. That condition, if not corrected, could result in excessive deviation from the intended flight path due to loss of navigation signals, and consequent potential low-fuel condition or a traffic conflict.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were received in response to the proposal.

## Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the rescission of the rule as proposed.

## Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein 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. Therefore, it is determined that this final rule does not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from 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.

## The Rescission

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 an airworthiness directive removing amendment 39-9365 to read as follows:

**95-19-04 R1 Learjet:** Amendment 39-11649. Docket No. 99-NM-311-AD. Rescinds AD 95-19-04, Amendment 39-9365.

**Applicability:** Model 35, 35A, 36, 36A, 55, 55B, and 55C airplanes; equipped with Global Wulfsburg GNS 500, GNS-1000, and GNS-X Flight Management Systems; certificated in any category.

This rescission is effective March 27, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on March 20, 2000.

**Donald L. Riggins,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 00-7335 Filed 3-24-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 99-AWA-3]

RIN 2120-AA66

### Revocation of the Sacramento McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) Class C Airspace Area, Establishment of the Sacramento McClellan AFB Class E Surface Area; and Modification of the Sacramento International Airport Class C Airspace Area; CA

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule revokes the Sacramento McClellan AFB, CA, Class C airspace area, establishes Class E airspace at Sacramento McClellan AFB, CA, and modifies the Sacramento International Airport, CA, Class C airspace area. Specifically, the FAA is revoking the Sacramento McClellan AFB Class C airspace area due to a reduction in the number of aircraft operations at McClellan AFB. This action also establishes a Class E surface area to provide controlled airspace for the protection of instrument approach operations to McClellan AFB. In addition, this action modifies the Sacramento International Airport Class C airspace area to provide additional airspace for the management of aircraft operations to and from the Sacramento International Airport. The FAA is making these changes to enhance safety, reduce the risk of midair collision, and improve the management of aircraft operations in the Sacramento terminal airspace area.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** 0901 UTC, September 7, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ken McElroy, Airspace and Rules Division, ATA-400, Office of Air Traffic Airspace Management, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267-8783.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

As announced in the **Federal Register** on October 13, 1998 (63 FR 54637), a public meeting was held on November 17, 1998, at Sacramento McClellan AFB, CA. The purpose of this meeting was to provide airspace users with an opportunity to provide their views, recommendations and comments regarding the FAA's planned modification to the Sacramento, CA,