

period of 5 years. The part of the review involving the evaluation for adequacy of interface with State and local governments must be available to the appropriate State and local governments.

* * * * *

PART 73—PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF PLANTS AND MATERIALS

3. The authority citation for Part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 53, 161, 68 Stat. 930, 948, as amended, sec. 147, 94 Stat. 780 (42 U.S.C. 2073, 2167, 2201); sec. 201, as amended, 204, 88 Stat. 1242, as amended, 1245, sec. 1701, 106 Stat. 2951, 2952, 2953 (42 U.S.C. 5841, 5844, 2297(f)).

Section 73.1 also issued under secs. 135, 141, Pub. L. 97-425, 96 Stat. 2232, 2241 (42 U.S.C. 10155, 10161). Section 73.37(f) also issued under sec. 301, Pub. L. 96-295, 94 Stat. 789 (42 U.S.C. 5841 note). Section 73.57 is issued under sec. 606, Pub. L. 99-399, 100 Stat. 876 (42 U.S.C. 2169).

4. Section 73.55 is amended by revising paragraph (g)(4) to read as follows:

§ 73.55 Requirements for physical protection of licensed activities in nuclear power reactors against radiological sabotage.

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(4)(1) The licensee shall review implementation of the security program by individuals who have no direct responsibility for the security program either:

(i) At intervals not to exceed 12 months, or

(ii) As necessary, based on an assessment by the licensee against performance indicators and as soon as reasonably practicable after a change occurs in personnel, procedures, equipment, or facilities that potentially could adversely affect security but no longer than 12 months after the change. In any case, each element of the security program must be reviewed at least every 24 months.

(2) The security program review must include an audit of security procedures and practices, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the physical protection system, an audit of the physical protection system testing and maintenance program, and an audit of commitments established for response by local law enforcement authorities. The results and recommendations of the security program review, management's findings on whether the security program is currently effective, and any actions taken as a result of recommendations from prior program reviews must be documented in a report

to the licensee's plant manager and to corporate management at least one level higher than that having responsibility for the day-to-day plant operation. These reports must be maintained in an auditable form, available for inspection, for a period of 3 years.

* * * * *

5. Appendix C to 10 CFR Part 73, Licensee Safeguards Contingency Plans, is amended by revising the section titled "Audit and Review" to read as follows:

Appendix C to Part 73—License Safeguards Contingency Plans

* * * * *

Audit and Review

(1) For nuclear facilities subject to the requirements of § 73.46, the licensee shall provide for a review of the safeguards contingency plan at intervals not to exceed 12 months. For nuclear power reactor licensees subject to the requirements of § 73.55, the licensee shall provide for a review of the safeguards contingency plan either:

(i) At intervals not to exceed 12 months, or
 (ii) As necessary, based on an assessment by the licensee against performance indicators, and as soon as reasonably practicable after a change occurs in personnel, procedures, equipment, or facilities that potentially could adversely affect security, but no longer than 12 months after the change. In any case, each element of the safeguards contingency plan must be reviewed at least every 24 months.

(2) A licensee subject to the requirements of either § 73.46 or § 73.55 shall ensure that the review of the safeguards contingency plan is by individuals independent of both security program management and personnel who have direct responsibility for implementation of the security program. The review must include an audit of safeguards contingency procedures and practices, and an audit of commitments established for response by local law enforcement authorities.

(3) The licensee shall document the results and the recommendations of the safeguards contingency plan review, management findings on whether the safeguards contingency plan is currently effective, and any actions taken as a result of recommendations from prior reviews in a report to the licensee's plant manager and to corporate management at least one level higher than that having responsibility for the day-to-day plant operation. The report must be maintained in an auditable form, available for inspection for a period of 3 years.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
William D. Travers,
Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 99-7597 Filed 3-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR part 25

[Docket No. NM153, Special Conditions No. 25-143-SC]

Special Conditions: Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, 36A Airplanes; High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: These special conditions are issued for Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, 36A airplanes modified by Learjet, Inc. These airplanes will have novel and unusual design features when compared to the state of technology envisioned in the airworthiness standards for transport category airplanes. These special conditions contain the additional safety standards that the Administrator considers necessary to establish a level of safety equivalent to that provided by the existing airworthiness standards.

DATES: The effective date of these special conditions is March 19, 1999; Comments must be received on or before April 28, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on these special conditions may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attn: Rules Docket (ANM-7), Docket No. NM153, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington, 98055-4056; or delivered in duplicate to the Office of the Regional Counsel at the above address. Comments must be marked: Docket No. NM153. Comments may be inspected in the Rules Docket weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ross Landes, FAA, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington, 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-1071; facsimile (425) 227-1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

The FAA has determined that good cause exists for making these special conditions effective upon issuance; however, interested persons are invited to submit such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket and special conditions

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. These special conditions may be changed in light of the comments received. All comments submitted 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. Persons wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this request must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket No. NM153." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On January 7, 1999, Learjet, Inc. applied for a supplemental type certificate (STC) to modify Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes listed on Type Certificate A10CE. The modification incorporates the installation of dual LITEF LCR-92, Attitude and Heading Reference Systems (AHRS) that provide air data input to both pilot and copilot flight instruments displaying critical flight parameters (attitude) to the flightcrew. The AHRS can be susceptible to disruption to both command/response signals as a result of electrical and magnetic interference. This disruption of signals could result in loss of all critical flight displays and annunciations or present misleading information to the pilot.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.101, Learjet, Inc. must show that the Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes, as changed, continue to meet the applicable provisions of the regulations incorporated by reference in Type Certificate No. A10CE, or the applicable regulations in effect on the

date of application for the change. The regulations incorporated by reference in the type certificate are commonly referred to as the "original type certification basis." The certification basis for the modified Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes includes 14 CFR part 25, dated February 1, 1965, with Amendments 25-1 through 25-18, as amended by Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS) A10CE.

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., part 25, as amended) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes because of novel or unusual design features, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of § 21.16 to establish a level of safety equivalent to that established in the regulations.

Special conditions, as appropriate, are issued in accordance with § 11.49 after public notice, as required by §§ 11.28 and 11.29, and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.101(b)(2).

Special conditions are initially applicable to the model for which they are issued. Should Learjet, Inc. apply at a later date for a design change approval to modify any other model already 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 Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes will incorporate a new dual Attitude and Heading Reference System (AHRS) that performs critical functions and was not available at the time of certification of these airplanes. This system may be vulnerable to high intensity radiated fields (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 Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A which require that new electrical and electronic systems, such as the AHRS, 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 (HIRF)

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 paragraphs 1, or 2 below:

1. A minimum threat of 100 volts per meter peak 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.

Field strength (volts per meter)	Frequency	
	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

Field strength (volts per meter)	Frequency	
	Peak	Average
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.

The threat levels identified above differ from those used in earlier special conditions. They 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. In general, these standards are less critical than the threat level that was previously used as the basis for earlier special conditions.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes modified by Learjet, Inc. Learjet Inc. may apply at a later date for design change approval 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).

Conclusion

This action affects only certain design features on Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes modified by Learjet, Inc. 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 the special conditions for this airplane has been subjected to the notice and comment procedure 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 immediately. Therefore, these special conditions are being made effective 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 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 Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A airplanes modified by Learjet, Inc.

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.

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 19, 1999.

John J. Hickey,

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

[FR Doc. 99-7626 Filed 3-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-CE-08-AD; Amendment 39-11096; AD 99-07-11]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA—Groupe Aerospatiale Model TBM 700 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to all SOCATA—Groupe Aerospatiale (SOCATA) Model TBM 700 airplanes. This AD requires inspecting the left-hand and right-hand outboard hinge fittings of the horizontal stabilizer for cracks, and replacing any cracked fitting. This AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for France. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent structural damage to the stabilizer caused by outboard hinge fitting cracks, which could result in uncontrolled flight if the hinges break.

DATES: Effective April 16, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of April 16, 1999.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before May 24, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-CE-08-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from SOCATA Groupe AEROSPATIALE, Customer