

Inspection Service has determined that this rule should be effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. The rule has been determined to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

The United States accounts for about 80 percent of the world's live reptile trade. In 1998, a total of 1,921,272 reptiles were imported, valued at approximately \$6.37 million. Of these, turtles, including tortoises, accounted for about 26.5 percent of imports. Three states, California (48 percent), Florida (33.2 percent), and Louisiana (11.7 percent), accounted for nearly 93 percent of turtle imports. Almost all turtles imported into the United States are wild caught.

The United States exports about 9 million live reptiles annually. Red-eared slider turtles make up about 85 percent of these exports every year. South Korea, Japan, and European countries are the major importers of U.S. turtles. However, Canada appears to be the major importer of leopard tortoise, African spurred tortoise, and Bell's hingeback tortoise. In 1995, the United States exported to Canada 32 leopard tortoises, 527 African spurred tortoises, and 2,332 Bell's hingeback tortoises. During the same year, U.S. imports of these species were 2,683, 1,223, and 952, respectively.

In 1996, between 1.5 million and 2.5 million households in the United States owned various reptiles as pets. Of these, about 534,000 households, or about 35 percent, owned a total of 950,000 turtles, including tortoises. Overall, turtles represented about 27 percent of the total reptile pet population. The prices paid for turtles ranged between \$25 and \$750, depending on species, size, and age. Between 1993 and 1996, the average price in the United States for a leopard tortoise was \$190, for an African spurred tortoise \$578, and for a Bell's hingeback tortoise \$35.

This rule will require persons wishing to move these tortoises interstate to acquire a health certificate or a certificate of veterinary inspection from an accredited veterinarian. We estimate that a certificate will cost about \$25 to \$50 for the first tortoise, plus \$2 to \$5 for each additional tortoise in the shipment. These costs are small when compared to the potential losses in revenue and animals that could result from a reinstitution of the prohibition on the interstate movement of these

species of tortoises. The health certificate will also help ensure the acceptability of these animals in international markets and prevent the spread of exotic ticks known to be vectors of heartwater disease, an acute infectious disease of ruminants, including cattle, sheep, goats, white-tailed deer, and antelope.

Heartwater disease has a 60 percent or greater mortality rate in livestock and a 90 percent or greater mortality rate in white-tailed deer. The direct contribution of the U.S. livestock industry to the gross domestic product is close to \$60 billion; with indirect and induced impacts taken into account, that figure could reach about \$150 billion. Considering the virulence and high mortality rate of heartwater disease, its introduction and spread in the United States could have severe economic consequences, even when a less than worst-case scenario is considered. Thus, the costs associated with this rule are far outweighed by the benefits of maintaining the United States' freedom from heartwater disease.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This final rule also affirms the information contained in the interim rules concerning Executive Orders 12372 and 12988.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection and recordkeeping requirements included in this rule have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under control number 0579-0156.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 74

Animal diseases, Livestock, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

Accordingly, the interim rules amending 9 CFR part 74 which were published at 65 FR 15216-15218 on March 22, 2000, and 65 FR 45275-45277 on July 21, 2000, are adopted as a final rule with the following changes:

PART 74—PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF LAND TORTOISES

1. The authority citation for part 74 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 111-113, 114a, 115, 117, 120, 122-126, 134b, 134f; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

2. Section 74.1 is revised to read as follows:

§ 74.1 General prohibition.

The interstate movement of leopard tortoise (*Geochelone pardalis*), African spurred tortoise (*Geochelone sulcata*), and Bell's hingeback tortoise (*Kinixys belliana*) is prohibited except when tortoises are accompanied by either a health certificate or a certificate of veterinary inspection. The health certificate or certificate of veterinary inspection must be signed by an accredited veterinarian within 30 days prior to the interstate movement and must state that the tortoises have been examined by that veterinarian and found free of ticks.

Done in Washington, DC, this 11th day of July 2001.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0579-0156)

Bobby R. Acord,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 01-17841 Filed 7-16-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. CE168, Special Condition 23-108-SC]

Special Conditions; Raytheon C90A; 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 Raytheon Aircraft Services, Inc., 1115 Paul Wilkens Road, San Antonio, Texas, 78216, for a Supplemental Type Certificate for the Raytheon C90A 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 electronic flight instrument system (EFIS) displays manufactured by Collins 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 May 25, 2001. Comments must be received on or before August 16, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE-7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. CE168, Room 506, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. CE168. 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:

Ervin Dvorak, 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. CE168." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On January 17, 2001, Raytheon Aircraft Services, Inc., 1115 Paul Wilkens Road, San Antonio, Texas, 78216, made an application to the FAA for a new Supplemental Type Certificate for the Raytheon C90A airplane. The C90A is currently approved under TC No. 3A20. The proposed modification incorporates a novel or unusual design feature, such as digital avionics consisting of a copilot's EFIS, that is vulnerable to HIRF external to the airplane.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR part 21, § 21.101, Raytheon Aircraft Services, Inc. (San Antonio) must show that the C90A aircraft meets the following provisions, or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change to Raytheon C90A: Under the provisions of 14 CFR part 21, 21.101, Raytheon Aircraft Services (San Antonio) must show that the C90A aircraft meets the following provisions, or the applicable regulations as specified in Type Certificate Data Sheet 3A20, Revision 58 dated March 15, 1999 and the special conditions adopted by this rule making 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 are normally issued in accordance with § 11.19, as required by §§ 11.38, and become a 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 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(a)(1).

Novel or Unusual Design Features

Raytheon Aircraft Services, Inc. (San Antonio) plans to incorporate certain novel and unusual design features into an airplane for which the airworthiness standards do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for protection from the effects of HIRF.

These features include a copilot's EFIS, which are susceptible to the HIRF environment, that were not envisaged by the existing regulations for this type of airplane.

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, peak 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 Raytheon C90A airplane. Should Raytheon Aircraft Services (San Antonio) 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(a)(1).

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 part 21, §§ 21.16 and 21.101; and 14 CFR part 11, §§ 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 Raytheon C90A airplane modified by Raytheon Aircraft Services (San Antonio) to add a copilot's EFIS.

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 May 25, 2001.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–17860 Filed 7–16–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NM–357–AD; Amendment 39–12327; AD 2001–14–16]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G–V Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Gulfstream Model G–V series airplanes, that requires repetitively replacing the existing nose wheel steering actuator with a new or reworked actuator having the same part number. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent loss of nose wheel steering control without a corresponding alert message annunciation due to the effects of moisture intrusion into the rotary variable displacement transducer (RVDT) inside the steering actuator, and consequently, an over steering condition. If an over steering condition were to occur during landing, the airplane could depart the runway. This action is intended to address the identified unsafe condition.