

**PART 550—PAY ADMINISTRATION (GENERAL)****Subpart G—Severance Pay**

■ 12. The authority citation for part 550, subpart G, continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 5595; E.O. 11257, 3 CFR, 1964–1965 Comp., p. 357.

**§ 550.703 [Amended]**

■ 13. In § 550.703, remove the word “readjustment” and add in its place the word “recruitment” wherever it appears.

**PART 551—PAY ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT (GENERAL)**

■ 14. The authority citation for part 551 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 5542(c); Sec. 4(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended by Pub. L. 93–259, 88 Stat. 55 (29 U.S.C. 204(f)).

**§ 551.423 [Amended]**

■ 15. In § 551.423, remove the word “readjustment” and add in its place the word “recruitment” wherever it appears.

**PART 720—AFFIRMATIVE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS**

■ 16. The authority citation for part 720 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 7201; 42 U.S.C. 2000e; 38 U.S.C. 101(2), 2011(3), 2014; 5 U.S.C. 3112; 29 U.S.C. 791(b).

■ 17. Revise § 720.301 to read as follows:

**§ 720.301 Purpose and authority.**

This subpart sets forth requirements for agency disabled veteran affirmative action programs (DVAAPs) designed to promote Federal employment and advancement opportunities for qualified disabled veterans. The regulations in this subpart are prescribed pursuant to responsibilities assigned to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) under 38 U.S.C. 4214, and section 307 of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. 3112).

[FR Doc. 05–23497 Filed 11–30–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6325–39–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE****Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service****7 CFR Part 319**

[Docket No. 03–019–4]

**Certification Program for Imported Articles of *Pelargonium* spp. and *Solanum* spp. to Prevent Introduction of Potato Brown Rot; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** We are correcting an error in the amendatory instructions in our final rule that amended the provisions of a certification program for articles of *Pelargonium* spp. and *Solanum* spp. imported from countries where the bacterium *Ralstonia solanacearum* race 3 biovar 2 is known to occur. The final rule was effective and published in the **Federal Register** on October 24, 2005 (70 FR 61351–61362, Docket No. 03–019–3).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 1, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Jeanne Van Dersal, Import Specialist, Phytosanitary Issues Management Team, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 140, Riverdale, MD 20737–1236; (301) 734–6653.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a final rule effective and published in the **Federal Register** on October 24, 2005 (70 FR 61351–61362, Docket No. 03–019–3), we amended the provisions of a certification program for articles of *Pelargonium* spp. and *Solanum* spp. imported from countries where the bacterium *Ralstonia solanacearum* race 3 biovar 2 is known to occur.

In the final rule, it was our intention to amend the regulations by amending paragraph (r)(3)(viii) of § 319.37–5 to modify its restrictions on growing media used in production of articles of *Pelargonium* spp. and *Solanum* spp. under the certification program. However, our amendatory instruction referred instead to paragraph (r)(3)(vii). This document corrects that error by revising paragraph (r)(3)(viii).

**List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 319**

Coffee, Cotton, Fruits, Imports, Logs, Nursery stock, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Rice, Vegetables.

■ Accordingly, 7 CFR part 319 is corrected by making the following correcting amendments:

**PART 319—FOREIGN QUARANTINE NOTICES**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 319 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701–7772, and 7781–7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

■ 2. In § 319.37–5, revise paragraph (r)(3)(viii) to read as follows:

**§ 319.37–5 Special foreign inspection and certification requirements.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(r) \* \* \*

(3) \* \* \*

(viii) Growing media for articles of *Pelargonium* spp. and *Solanum* spp. must be free of *R. solanacearum* race 3 biovar 2. Growing media and containers for articles of *Pelargonium* spp. and *Solanum* spp. must not come in contact with growing media that could transmit *R. solanacearum* race 3 biovar 2 and must be grown in an APHIS-approved growing medium.

\* \* \* \* \*

Done in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of November 2005.

**Elizabeth E. Gaston,**

*Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 05–23531 Filed 11–30–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–34–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 23**

[Docket No. CE218, Special Condition 23–158–SC]

**Special Conditions; Cessna Aircraft Company; 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 Cessna Aircraft Co., for the Type Certificate of Model 510 Mustang airplane. This airplane will have novel and unusual design features when compared to the state of technology envisaged in the applicable airworthiness standards. The novel and unusual design features include the installation of an Electronic Flight Instrumentation System (EFIS), Digital Air Data Computer (ADC), and a Full Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC). The applicable regulations do not adequately consider failure of

electrical and electronic systems performing critical functions from the effects of external 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 this airplane.

**DATES:** The effective date of these special conditions is November 17, 2005. Comments must be received on or before January 3, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE-7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. CE218, Room 506, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. CE218. 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 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. CE218." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

#### Background

On January 28, 2004, Cessna Aircraft Company; One Cessna Boulevard; Post Office Box 7704; Wichita, KS 67277, made an application to the FAA for a new Type Certificate for the Cessna Model 510 Mustang. The Cessna 510 will be approved under a new Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS) Number when Type Certificate (TC) is issued. The proposed modification incorporates a novel or unusual design feature, a digital air data computer, which may be vulnerable to HIRF external to the airplane.

#### Type Certification Basis

Under the terms of § 21.17, Cessna Aircraft must show that the Model 510 Mustang meets the following provisions, the provisions of other applicable special conditions, or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for their type certificate: Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) part 23 effective February 1, 1965 as amended by Amendments 23-1 through 23-54; Special Conditions applied to § 23.45, § 23.51, § 23.53, § 23.55, § 23.57, § 23.59, § 23.61, § 23.63, § 23.66, § 23.67, § 23.73, § 23.75, § 23.77, § 23.177, § 23.201(e), § 23.203(c), § 23.251, § 23.253, § 23.735, § 23.1195, § 23.1197, § 23.1199, § 23.1201, § 23.1323, § 23.1505, § 23.1583, § 23.1585, § 23.1587; Equivalent Levels of Safety applied to § 23.1305(c)(2), § 23.1305(c)(5), § 23.1549(a) thru (d), § 23.841(b)(6), § 23.841(a), § 23.807(e), § 23.1435(a)(2), and § 23.1555(d); an exemption to § 23.181(b); FAR part 34 as amended by the Amendment in effect on the date of certification; and FAR part 36 as amended by the Amendment in effect on the day of application; the certification requirements applied to the EFIS, Air Data Computer, and FADEC, and these terms of these Special Conditions.

#### 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 models 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 § 21.17.

#### Novel or Unusual Design Features

Cessna 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 the addition of an EFIS, ADC, and FADEC, which may be 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 electromagnetic 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, 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 Cessna Model 510 Mustang airplane. Should Cessna 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.

**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 Cessna Model 510 Mustang airplane.

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 HIRF 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 17, 2005.

**David R. Showers,**  
*Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 05–23523 Filed 11–30–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 23**

[Docket No. CE235, Special Condition 23–175–SC]

**Special Conditions; New Piper Aircraft, Inc.; PA–34; 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 the New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Vero Beach, Florida, for a type design