

other commodity (for example, could it lead to over insurance of the crop for which a written agreement is sought) and whether an actuarially sound premium rate can be determined that will cover the anticipated losses and a reasonable reserve for the crop for which a written agreement is being sought.

Good cause is shown to make this rule effective upon filing for public inspection at the Office of the Federal Register. Good cause to make the rule effective upon filing at the Office of the Federal Register exists when the 30 day delay in the effective date is impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. The changes in this rule are statutorily mandated.

With respect to the provisions of this rule, it would be contrary to the public interest to delay its implementation. Further, such changes regarding written agreements for producers in areas of the United States where crop insurance is not available for a particular commodity are in the public interest. This is because the changes will allow a producer to submit records of a crop that is similar to the crop for which insurance is being requested, and expand the availability of insurance for a producer who may not have previously qualified.

If FCIC is required to delay the implementation of this rule 30 days after the date it is published, the provisions of this rule could not be implemented until the next crop year for those crops having a contract change date prior to the effective date of this publication. This would mean that the affected producers would be without the benefits described above for an additional year.

For the reasons stated above, good cause exists to make these policy changes effective upon filing with the Office of the Federal Register.

**List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 457**

Crop insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

**Interim Rule**

■ Accordingly, as set forth in the preamble, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation amends 7 CFR part 457 effective for the 2006 and succeeding crop years for all crops with a contract change date on or after the effective date of this rule and for the 2007 and succeeding crop years for all crops with a contract change date prior to the effective date of this rule, as follows:

**PART 457—COMMON CROP INSURANCE REGULATIONS**

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 457 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 1506(l), 1506(p).

■ 2. Amend § 457.8, as follows:

■ (a) Revise section 18(f)(2)(i); and

■ (b) Revise section 18(f)(2)(ii).

The revised sections read as follows:

18. Written Agreements

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(2) \* \* \*

(i) A completed APH form (except for policies that do not require APH) based on verifiable records of actual yields for:

(A) The crop and county for which the written agreement is being requested (the actual yields do not necessarily have to be from the same physical acreage for which you are requesting a written agreement) for at least the most recent three crop years in which the crop was planted during the base period; or

(B) A similar crop in the county, or a combination of actual yields for a similar crop in the county and the crop in the county for which the written agreement is being requested if you have not produced the crop for which the written agreement is being requested for at least three crop years.

(1) To be considered a similar crop to the crop for which a written agreement is being requested, such crop must:

(i) Be included in the same category of crops, e.g., row crops (including, but not limited to, small grains, coarse grains, and oil seed crops), vegetable crops grown in rows, tree crops, vine crops, bush crops, etc., as defined by FCIC;

(ii) Have substantially the same growing season (i.e., normally planted around the same dates and harvested around the same dates);

(iii) Require comparable agronomic conditions (e.g., comparable water, soil, etc. needs); and

(iv) Be subject to substantially the same risks (frequency and severity of loss would be expected to be comparable from the same cause of loss);

(2) The actual yields for the similar crop do not necessarily have to be from the same physical acreage for which you are requesting a written agreement;

(ii) Acceptable production records for at least the most recent three crop years in which the crop or a similar crop was planted;

\* \* \* \* \*

Signed in Washington, DC, on November 22, 2005.

**Eldon Gould,**

*Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 05-23509 Filed 11-25-05; 4:21 pm]

**BILLING CODE 3410-08-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 23**

**[Docket No. CE234, Special Condition 23-174-SC]**

**Special Conditions; Garmin AT, Inc. EFIS on the Mooney M20M and M20R; Protection of Systems From 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 Garmin AT, Inc., 2345 Turner Rd. SE, Salem, OR 97302, for a Supplemental Type Certificate for the Mooney M20M and M20R. These airplanes 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 an electronic flight instrument system (EFIS) display, Model G-1000, manufactured by Garmin International, 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 November 3, 2005. Comments must be received on or before December 30, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE-7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. CE234, Room 506, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. CE234. 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:** Wes Ryan, 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) 329-4127.

**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. CE234." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

**Background**

On August 13, 2004, Garmin AT, Inc., 2345 Turner Rd. SE, Salem, OR 97302, made an application to the FAA for a new Supplemental Type Certificate for the Mooney M20M and M20R. The Mooney M20M and M20R are currently approved under TC No. 2A3. The proposed modification incorporates a novel or unusual design feature, such as digital avionics consisting of an EFIS that is vulnerable to HIRF external to the airplane.

**Type Certification Basis**

Under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.101, Garmin AT, Inc. must show that

the Mooney M20M and M20R meet their original certification basis, as listed on Type Data Sheet 2A3, the additional certification requirements added for the G1000 system, exemptions, if any; and the special conditions adopted by this rulemaking action. The additional certification requirements for the G1000 system include §§ 23.1301, 23.1309, 23.1311, 23.1322, 23.1353 and other rules at the amendment appropriate for the date of application. Further details of the certification basis for the installation of the G1000 EFIS are available on request.

**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, as appropriate, as defined in § 11.19, are issued in accordance with § 11.38 after public notice and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.101.

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.

**Novel or Unusual Design Features**

Garmin AT, Inc. plans to incorporate certain novel and unusual design features into the Mooney M20M and M20R for which the airworthiness standards do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for protection from the effects of HIRF. These features include 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:

(2) 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

Frequency	Field strength (volts per meter)	
	Peak	Average
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, 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 to the Mooney M20M and M20R. Should Garmin AT, Inc. 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.

**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 21.16 and 21.101; and 14 CFR 11.38 and 11.19.

**PART 23—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: NORMAL, UTILITY, ACROBATIC, AND COMMUTER CATEGORY AIRPLANES**

**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 the Mooney M20M and M20R airplanes modified by Garmin AT, Inc. to add the G1000 EFIS system.

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 November 3, 2005.

**William J. Timberlake,**

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

[FR Doc. 05–23481 Filed 11–29–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. FAA–2005–22731; Directorate Identifier 2005–NE–36–AD; Amendment 39–14389; AD 2005–24–09]

**RIN 2120–AA64**

**Airworthiness Directives; McCauley Propeller Systems Propeller Assemblies Models 2D34C53/74E–X; D2A34C58/90AT–X; 3AF32C87/82NC–X; D3AF32C87/82NC–X; D3A32C88/82NC–X; D3A32C90/82NC–X; and 3AF34C92/90LF–X.**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for McCauley Propeller Systems propeller assemblies, models 2D34C53/74E–X; D2A34C58/90AT–X; 3AF32C87/82NC–X; D3AF32C87/82NC–X; D3A32C88/82NC–X; D3A32C90/82NC–X; and 3AF34C92/90LF–X. This AD requires, within 10 flight hours or 10 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, removing certain serial number propeller hubs from service. This AD results from a report by the manufacturer that they manufactured and released 40 propeller hubs with improperly machined socket retention threads. We are issuing this AD to prevent cracked propeller hubs, which could cause failure of the propeller hub, blade separation, and loss of control of the airplane.

**DATES:** This AD becomes effective December 15, 2005.

We must receive any comments on this AD by January 30, 2006.