

1. A minimum threat of 100 volts rms (root-mean-square) 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 field strengths identified in the table below for the frequency ranges indicated. Both peak and average field strength components from the table are to be demonstrated.

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 to McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, –83, and –87 airplanes modified by Electronic Cable Specialists. Should Electronic Cable Specialists apply later for design change approval to modify any other model included on Type Certificate A6WE 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), Amendment 21–69, effective September 16, 1991.

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, –83, and –87 airplanes modified by

Electronic Cable Specialists. It is not a rule of general applicability and affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on these airplanes.

The FAA has determined that notice and opportunity for public comment are unnecessary, because the FAA has provided previous opportunities to comment on substantially identical special conditions and has fully considered and addressed all the substantive comments received. The FAA is satisfied that new comments are unlikely and finds, therefore, that good cause exists for making these special conditions effective upon issuance.

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 supplemental type certification basis for McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, –83, and –87 airplanes modified by Electronic Cable Specialists.

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 April 14, 2003.

Ali Bahrami

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03–11227 Filed 5–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2003–14735; Airspace Docket No. 03–AEA–02]

Amendment of Class D Airspace, Rome, NY

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment removes the description of the Class D airspace designated for Rome, NY. The commissioning of the Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) at Griffiss Airpark, Rome, NY has been delayed indefinitely. Therefore, the Class D airspace designated for Griffiss Airpark cannot be supported and will be removed.

DATES: May 7, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the rule in triplicate to: Manager, Airspace Branch, AEA–520, Docket No. FAA–2003–14735; Airspace Docket No. 03–AEA–02, FAA Eastern Region, 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434–4809.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Regional Counsel, AEA–7, FAA Eastern Region, 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434–4809; telephone (718) 553–3255. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the address listed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Francis Jordan, Airspace Specialist, Airspace Branch, AEA–520, Air Traffic Division, Eastern Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434–4809, telephone: (718) 553–4521.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Although this action is a final rule, which involves the amendment of the Class D at Rome, NY, by removing that airspace designated for Griffiss Airpark, and was not preceded by notice and public procedure, comments are invited on the rule.

Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in evaluating the effects of the rule and in determining whether additional rulemaking is required. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the rule which might suggest the need to modify the rule.

History

Federal Register document 02–29902, Airspace Docket No. 02–AEA–13, published in the **Federal Register** on November 25, 2002 (67 FR 70533–70534) established the description of the Class D airspace area at Rome, NY. **Federal Register** document 03–6333, Airspace Docket No. 02–AEA–13, published in the **Federal Register** on March 17, 2003 (68 FR 12582–12583) delayed the effective date of the establishment of the Class D airspace at Rome, NY. Subsequently, the commissioning date for the ATCT has been delayed indefinitely and the need for Class D airspace cannot be supported.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) removes the description of the Class D airspace at Rome, NY, by removing that airspace designated for Griffiss Airpark. The commissioning of the ATCT has been delayed indefinitely. As a result the Rome, NY, Class D airspace is no longer required for air safety. Class D airspace designations for airspace extending upward from the surface of the earth are published in paragraph 5000 of FAA Order 7400.9K, dated August 30, 2002, and effective September 16, 2002, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1.

Under the circumstances presented, the FAA concludes that the more restrictive Class D airspace at Rome, NY is no longer supported and the flight rules pertinent to Class E airspace should apply. Accordingly, since this action merely reverts the Rome, NY, Class D airspace to Class E, notice and public procedure under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) are unnecessary.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this regulation: (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 will not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporated by reference, Navigation (air).

Adoption of the Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

- 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854; 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 289.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

- 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9K, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 30, 2002 and effective September 16, 2002, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 5000 Class D airspace areas extending upward from the surface of the earth.

* * * * *

AEA NY D Rome, NY [Removed]

* * * * *

Dated: Issued in Jamaica, New York on April 17, 2003.

Loretta Martin,

Acting Assistant Manager, Air Traffic Division, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 03–11232 Filed 5–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. FAA–01–ANM–16]

Establishment of Class E Airspace at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action will establish Class E5 airspace at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT. Recently developed Area Navigation (RNAV)/Global Positioning (GPS) Standard Terminal Arrival Routes (STARs) and Departure Procedures (DPs) have made this action necessary for the containment of aircraft executing Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) operations at Richfield Municipal Airport within controlled airspace. The intended effect

of this action is to provide an increased level of safety for aircraft executing IFR operations between the terminal and en route phase of flight at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 7, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ed Haeseker, ANM–520.7; telephone (425) 227–2527; Federal Aviation Administration, Docket No. 01–ANM–16, 1601 Lind Avenue SW, Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On December 2, 2002, the FAA issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to amend Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 71 (14 CFR part 71) by establishing Class E5 airspace at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT. [67 FR 71058]. The proposal would provide an increased level of safety for aircraft executing IFR operations between terminal and en route phases of flight at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT. Interested parties were invited to participate in the rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal. No comments were received. Class E5 airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface, is published in Paragraph 6005, of FAA Order 7400.9K, dated August 30, 2002, and effective September 16, 2002, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR Part 71. The Class E5 airspace designation listed in this document will subsequently be published in the Order.

The Rule

This amendment to 14 CFR part 71 establishes Class E5 airspace at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT. Class E5 controlled airspace is necessary to contain aircraft executing IFR operations at Richfield Municipal Airport. The FAA establishes Class E5 airspace, where necessary, to contain aircraft transitioning between terminal and en route environments. This rule is designed to provide for the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace and to promote safe flight operations under IFR at Richfield Municipal Airport and between terminal and en route transition phases. The new Class E5 airspace will be depicted on aeronautical charts for pilot reference. The Coordinates for this airspace docket are based on North American Datum 83. The FAA has determined that this 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