

**§ 391.4 Laboratory services rate.**

The rate for laboratory services provided pursuant to §§ 350.7, 351.9, 352.5, 354.101, 355.12, and 362.5 is \$67.83 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2006, \$69.31 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2007, and \$70.82 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2008.

■ 3. In § 391.5, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 391.5 Laboratory accreditation fee.**

(a) The annual fee for the initial accreditation and maintenance of accreditation provided pursuant to §§ 318.21 and 381.153 shall be \$4,000.00 for fiscal year 2006; \$4,500.00 for fiscal year 2007; and \$4,500.00 for fiscal year 2008.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PART 590—INSPECTION OF EGGS AND EGG PRODUCTS (EGG PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT)**

■ 4. The authority citation for part 590 continues to read as follows:

*Authority:* 21 U.S.C. 1031–1056.

■ 5. Section 590.126 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 590.126 Overtime inspection service.**

When operations in an official plant require the services of inspection personnel beyond their regularly assigned tour of duty on any day or on a day outside the established schedule, such services are considered as overtime work. The official plant must give reasonable advance notice to the inspector of any overtime service necessary and must pay the Agency for such overtime at an hourly rate of \$56.40 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2006, \$57.65 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2007, and \$58.93 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2008.

■ 6. In § 590.128, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 590.128 Holiday inspection service.**

(a) When an official plant requires inspection service on a holiday or a day designated in lieu of a holiday, such service is considered holiday work. The official plant must, in advance of such holiday work, request that the inspector in charge furnish inspection service during such period and must pay the Agency for such holiday work at an hourly rate of \$56.40 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2006, \$57.65 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2007, and \$58.93 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2008.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PART 592—VOLUNTARY INSPECTION OF EGG PRODUCTS**

■ 7. The authority citation for part 592 continues to read as follows:

*Authority:* 7 U.S.C. 1621–1627.

■ 8. Sections 592.510, 592.520 and 592.530 are revised to read as follows:

**§ 592.510 Base time rate.**

The base time rate for voluntary inspection services for egg products is \$47.79 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2006, \$48.84 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2007, and \$49.93 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2008.

**§ 592.520 Overtime rate.**

When operations in an official plant require the services of inspection personnel beyond their regularly assigned tour of duty on any day or on a day outside the established schedule, such services are considered as overtime work. The official plant must give reasonable advance notice to the inspection program personnel of any overtime service necessary and must pay the Agency for such overtime at an hourly rate of \$56.40 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2006, \$57.65 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2007, and \$58.93 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2008.

**§ 592.530 Holiday rate.**

When an official plant requires inspection service on a holiday or a day designated in lieu of a holiday, such service is considered holiday work. The official plant must, in advance of such holiday work, request that the inspector in charge furnish inspection service during such period and must pay the Agency for such holiday work at an hourly rate of \$56.40 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2006, \$57.65 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2007, and \$58.93 per hour per program employee in fiscal year 2008.

Done in Washington, DC, on January 10, 2006.

**Bryce Quick,**

*Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 06–321 Filed 1–12–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P**

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

[Docket No. CE238, Special Condition 23–178–SC]

**Special Conditions; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc.; PA–44–180; 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 change for the PA–44–180 airplanes. 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 electronic flight instrument system (EFIS) displays Model 700–00006–XXX(), manufactured by Avidyne Corporation, Inc. 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 January 6, 2006. Comments must be received on or before February 13, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE–7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. CE238, Room 506, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. CE238. 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. CE238." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

#### Background

The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Vero Beach, Florida, has made application to revise the type design of the PA-44-180 model airplane. The model is currently approved under the type certification basis listed on Type Certificate Data Sheets (TCDS) A19SO. 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 part 21, § 21.101, The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., must show that affected airplane models, as changed, continue to meet the applicable provisions of the regulations identified on the appropriate TCDS. In addition, the type certification basis of the airplanes embodying this modification will include the additional certification basis for installation of the

Avidyne Entegra EFIS is: PA-44-180 model aircraft: 14 CFR Part 23 regulations FAR 23.301, 23.337, 23.341, 23.473, 23.561, 23.607, 23.611, as amended by Amdt. 23-48; FAR 23.305, 23.397, 23.613, 23.773, 23.1525, 23.1549 as amended by Amdt. 23-45; FAR 23.777, 23.955, 23.1337 as amended by Amdt. 23-51; FAR 23.1303, 23.1307, 23.1309, 23.1311, 23.1321, 23.1323, 23.1329, 23.1351, 23.1353, 23.1359, 23.1361, 23.1365, 23.1431 as amended by Amdt. 23-49; FAR 23.1305 as amended by Amdt. 23-52; FAR 23.1322, 23.1331, 23.1357 as amended by Amdt. 23-43; FAR 23.1325, 23.1543, 23.1545, 23.1555, 23.1563, 23.1581, 23.1583, 23.1585 as amended by Amdt. 23-50; FAR 23.1523 as amended by Amdt. 23-34; FAR 23.1529 as amended by Amdt. 23-26; FAR 23.1501 and 23.1541 as amended by Amdt. 23-21; FAR 23.1327 as amended by Amdt. 23-20; and the special conditions adopted by this rulemaking 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, 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(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.

#### Novel or Unusual Design Features

The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., 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 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
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 New Piper PA-44-180 model airplanes.

#### 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 New Piper PA-44-180 model airplanes modified by installation of the factory optional Avidyne Entegra 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 January 6, 2006.

**John Colomy,**

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

[FR Doc. 06-341 Filed 1-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 05-AWP-12]

#### Establishment of a Class E Enroute Domestic Airspace Area, San Luis Obispo, CA

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** This action withdraws the direct final rule published in the **Federal Register** on November 14, 2005, (70 FR 69077). In that action, the FAA proposed to establish a Class E enroute domestic airspace west of San Luis Obispo, CA, to replace existing Class G uncontrolled airspace. The FAA has determined that the boundaries of this airspace will be revised and another direct final rule resubmitted for publication.

**DATES:** The direct final rule published November 14, 2005 (70 FR 69077) is withdrawn as of January 13, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Francie Hope, Western Terminal Operations Airspace Specialist, AWP-520.3, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California 90261, telephone (310) 725-6502.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On November 14, 2005, a direct final rule was published in the **Federal Register** to establish a Class E enroute domestic airspace area west of San Luis Obispo to contain aircraft while in Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) conditions and under control of Santa Barbara Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON). On November 2, 2005, airspace was transferred from Los Angeles Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) to Santa Barbara TRACON. In order to provide