

Proposed Rules

Federal Register

Vol. 63, No. 211

Monday, November 2, 1998

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 532

RIN 3206-AI48

Prevailing Rate Systems; Lead Agency Responsibility

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Proposed rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is issuing a proposed rule that would change the lead agency responsibility for certain Federal Wage System (FWS) appropriated fund wage areas from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to the Department of Defense (DOD). A lead agency under the FWS is the Federal agency designated by OPM to conduct local wage surveys and establish wage schedules for FWS employees according to local prevailing rates within a wage area. There are currently 133 FWS appropriated fund wage areas. DOD is currently the lead agency in 110 wage areas, and VA is the lead agency in 23 wage areas. VA has requested that OPM designate DOD as the lead agency in all of the wage areas where VA currently has lead agency responsibility. This change would make DOD the lead agency in all FWS wage areas and is proposed because it would make more efficient use of the resources devoted by agencies to determining FWS pay rates.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 2, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to Donald J. Winstead, Assistant Director for Compensation Administration, Workforce Compensation and Performance Service, Office of Personnel Management, Room 7H31, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20415, or FAX: (202) 606-4264.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark A. Allen at (202) 606-2848, or email: maallen@opm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under 5 U.S.C. 5343(a)(2), the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is responsible for designating lead agencies in Federal Wage System (FWS) wage areas. Lead agencies are responsible for conducting surveys of private sector employers to establish wage schedules for FWS employees based on local prevailing rates. The Department of Defense (DOD) is the lead agency in 110 FWS wage areas, and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is the lead agency in 23 FWS wage areas. VA is currently the lead agency in the New Haven-Hartford, Connecticut; Miami, Florida; Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida; Champaign-Urbana, Illinois; Chicago, Illinois; Cedar Rapids-Iowa City, Iowa; Des Moines, Iowa; Augusta, Maine; Boston, Massachusetts; Southwestern Michigan; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; New York, New York; Rochester, New York; Asheville, North Carolina; Charlotte, North Carolina; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Southwestern Oregon; Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; Eastern Tennessee; Houston-Galveston-Texas City, Texas; Roanoke, Virginia; and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, FWS wage areas.

VA has requested that OPM designate DOD as the lead agency in the wage areas where VA is currently designated as the lead agency. Since the establishment of the FWS in 1972, VA has played a key role in the administration of the pay program for FWS employees. However, for the past few years, VA has experienced reductions in overall employment in the human resources management areas both in field and headquarters activities. At the headquarters level, two out of three experienced specialists assigned to oversee FWS wage surveys are no longer available to work in that area because of retirements and reassignments. VA believes that a consolidation of the FWS survey function within one agency would be more efficient and would provide a consistency in the survey process that would strengthen the FWS program nationwide. DOD has expressed its willingness and indicated its ability to assume lead agency responsibility in the wage areas where VA is currently assigned lead agency responsibility.

This proposed change was reviewed by the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC), the national labor-

management committee responsible for advising OPM on matters that affect the pay of FWS employees. The Committee recommended approval of the change by majority vote. The management members of FPRAC proposed this change because diminishing staff resources within VA headquarters have made it very difficult for VA to accomplish its wage survey work in an effective manner, and DOD has expressed its ability and willingness to assume lead agency responsibility in all FWS wage areas. All Committee members voted for the proposal except for the National Federation of Federal Employees, which abstained. The remaining labor members of FPRAC supported the proposed change with reservations, stating that although no reasonable alternative exists, they are concerned about the placement of Governmentwide FWS wage determinations within a single agency.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that these regulations would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they would affect only Federal agencies and employees.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Director.

Accordingly, the Office of Personnel Management is proposing to amend 5 CFR part 532 as follows:

PART 532—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS

1. The authority citation for part 532 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5343, 5346; § 532.707 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552.

2. Appendix A to subpart B is amended for the New Haven-Hartford, Connecticut; Miami, Florida; Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida; Champaign-Urbana, Illinois; Chicago, Illinois; Cedar Rapids-Iowa City, Iowa; Des Moines, Iowa; Augusta, Maine; Boston, Massachusetts; Southwestern Michigan; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; New York, New York; Rochester, New York; Asheville, North Carolina; Charlotte, North

Carolina; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Southwestern Oregon; Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; Eastern Tennessee; Houston-Galveston-Texas City, Texas; Roanoke, Virginia; and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, wage areas by revising the lead agency listings for those areas from "VA" to "DOD".

[FR Doc. 98-29190 Filed 10-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. CE145, Notice No. 23-98-01-SC]

Special Conditions; Raytheon Model 390 Airplane

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed special conditions.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes special conditions for the Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 airplane. This new airplane will have novel and unusual design features not typically associated with normal, utility, acrobatic, and commuter category airplanes. These design features include turbofan engines, engine location, swept wings and stabilizer, and certain performance characteristics necessary for this type of airplane, for which the applicable regulations do not contain adequate or appropriate airworthiness standards. This notice contains the additional airworthiness standards that the Administrator considers necessary to establish a level of safety equivalent to that existing in the current business jet fleet and expected by the user of this class of aircraft.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 2, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this proposal may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE-7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. CE145, Room No. 1558, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. CE145. 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: Lowell Foster, Aerospace Engineer, Standards Office (ACE-110), Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Room 1544, 601 East

12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone (816) 426-5688.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of these special conditions by submitting 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 specified above will be considered by the Administrator before taking further rulemaking action on this proposal. 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. CE145." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received. All comments received will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the rules docket for examination by interested parties. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Background

On August 1, 1995, Raytheon Aircraft Company (then Beech Aircraft Corporation), 9707 East Central, Wichita, Kansas 67201, made application for 14 CFR part 23 normal category type certification of its Model 390 airplane. The Model 390 has a composite fuselage, a metal wing with 22.8 degrees of leading-edge sweepback, and a combination composite/metal empennage in a T-tail configuration with trimmable horizontal tail with 27.3 degrees of leading-edge sweepback. The airplane will accommodate six passengers and a crew of two. The Model 390 will have a V_{MO}/M_{MO} of 320 knots/M.83, and has two turbofan engines mounted on the aft fuselage above and behind the wing.

Type Certification Basis

Type certification basis of the Model 390 airplane is as follows: 14 CFR part 23, effective February 1, 1965, through Amendment 23-52, effective July 25, 1996; 14 CFR part 36, effective December 1, 1969, through the amendment effective on the date of type certification; 14 CFR part 34; exemptions, if any; and the special

conditions adopted by this rulemaking action.

Discussion

Special conditions may be issued and amended, as necessary, as part of the type certification basis if the Administrator finds that the airworthiness standards designated in accordance with 14 CFR part 21, § 21.17(a)(1), do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards because of novel or unusual design features of an airplane. Special conditions, as appropriate, are issued in accordance with 14 CFR part 11, § 11.49, after public notice, as required by §§ 11.28 and 11.29(b), effective October 14, 1980, and become part of the type certification basis as provided by part 21, § 21.17(a)(2).

Raytheon plans to incorporate certain novel and unusual design features into the Model 390 airplane for which the airworthiness regulations do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards. These features include turbofan engines, engine location, swept wings and stabilizer, and certain performance characteristics necessary for this type of airplane.

Performance

The Raytheon Model 390 has a wing with 22.8 degrees of leading-edge sweepback and a T-tail configuration with trimmable horizontal stabilizer with 27.3 degrees of leading-edge sweepback. The Model 390 will have a V_{MO}/M_{MO} of 320 knots/M.83, and it will have two turbofan engines mounted on the aft fuselage.

Previous certification and operational experience with airplanes of like design in the transport category reveal certain unique characteristics compared to conventional aircraft certificated under part 23. These characteristics have caused safety problems in the past when pilots attempted takeoffs and landings, particularly with a large variation in temperature and altitude, using procedures and instincts developed with conventional airplanes.

One of the major distinguishing features of a swept-wing design not considered in current part 23 is a characteristically flatter lift curve without a "stall" break near the maximum coefficient of lift, as in a conventional wing. The "stall" separation point may occur at a much higher angle of attack than the point of maximum lift, and the angle of attack for maximum lift can be only recognized by precise test measurements or specific detection systems. This phenomenon is not apparent to a pilot accustomed to operating a conventional airplane where