regions shall be deemed to have an approximately equal number of voting shareholders if no region contains more than 25 percent more voting shareholders than in any other region. At least once every 3 years, the institution shall count the number of voting shareholders in each region and, if the regions do not have an approximately equal number of shareholders, shall adjust the regional boundaries to achieve such result; and

(iv) An institution may provide for more than one director to represent a region. In such case, for purposes of determining whether the regions have an approximately equal number of voting shareholders, the number of voting shareholders in the region with more than one director shall be divided by the number of director positions representing that region, and the resulting quotient shall be the number that is compared to the number of voting shareholders in other regions.

* * * * *

PART 620—DISCLOSURE TO SHAREHOLDERS

3. The authority citation for part 620 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 5.17, 5.19, 8.11 of the Farm Credit Act (12 U.S.C. 2252, 2254, 2279aa–11); sec. 424 of Pub. L. 100–233, 101 Stat. 1568, 1656.

Subpart D—Association Annual Meeting Information Statement

4. Section 620.21 is amended by adding the words ''or elected'' after the word ''nominated'' in the first sentence of paragraph (d)(1); and by revising paragraph (d)(3) to read as follows:

§ 620.21 Contents of the information statement and other information to be furnished in connection with the annual meeting.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

* * * * *

(3) State that nominations shall be accepted from the floor.

(i) If directors are not elected by region, the following shall apply:

(A) If the annual meeting is to be held in more than one session and mail balloting will be conducted upon the conclusion of all sessions, state that nominations from the floor may be made at any session or, if the association's bylaws so provide, state that nominations from the floor shall be accepted only at the first session.

(B) If shareholders will not vote solely by mail ballot upon conclusion of all sessions, state that nominations from the floor may be made only at the first session.

(ii) If directors are elected by region, the following shall apply:

(A) If more than one session of an annual meeting is held in a region, and if mail balloting will be conducted at the end of all sessions in a region, state that nominations from the floor may be made at any session in the region or, if the association's bylaws so provide, state that nominations from the floor shall be accepted only at the first session held in the region.

(B) If shareholders will not vote solely by mail ballot upon conclusion of all sessions in a region, state that nominations from the floor may be made only at the first session held in the region.

* * * * *

Dated: November 17, 1995.

Floyd Fithian,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 95–28587 Filed 11–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. 128CE, Special Condition 23–ACE–83]

Special Conditions; Beech Model 58 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: These special conditions are issued for the Beech Model 58 airplanes modified by ElectroSonics Division of AiRadio Corporation, Columbus, Ohio. 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 displays 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.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of these special conditions is on publication in the Federal Register. Comments must be received on or before December 26, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, ACE–7, Attention: Rules Docket Clerk, Docket No. 128CE, Room 1558, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. 128CE. 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, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone (816) 426–6941.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety, and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on these special conditions.

Interested persons are invited to submit such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket and special conditions 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. These special conditions may be changed in light of the comments received. All comments submitted will be available in the rules docket for examination by interested parties, 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. Persons wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments, submitted in response to this request, must include a self-addressed and stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 128CE.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On September 25, 1995, ElectroSonics Division of AiRadio Corporation, P.O. Box 360436, Columbus International Airport, Columbus, Ohio 43236, made an application to the FAA for a supplemental type certificate (STC) for the Beech Model 58 airplanes. The

proposed modification incorporates a novel or unusual design feature, such as digital avionics consisting of an electronic flight instrument system (EFIS), that is vulnerable to HIRF external to the airplane.

Type Certification Basis

The type certification basis for the Beech Model 58 Airplanes is given in Type Certification Data Sheet No. 3A16 plus the following: § 23.1301 of Amendment 23–20; §§ 23.1309, 23.1311, and 23.1321 of Amendment 23–41; and § 23.1322 of Amendment 23–43; exemptions, if any; and the special conditions adopted by this rulemaking action.

Discussion

The FAA may issue and amend special conditions, as necessary, as part of the type certification basis if the Administrator finds that the airworthiness standards, designated according to § 21.101(b), 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 to establish a level of safety equivalent to that established in the regulations. Special conditions are normally issued according to § 11.49, after public notice, as required by §§ 11.28 and 11.29(b), effective October 14, 1980, and become a part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.101(b)(2).

ElectroSonics Division of AiRadio Corporation, 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 electronic systems, 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:

FIELD STRENGTH VOLTS/METER

Frequency	Peak	Average
10–100 KHz	50	50
100–500	60	60
500–2000	70	70
2–30 MHz	200	200
30–70	30	30
70–100	30	30
100–200	150	33
200–400	70	70
400–700	4020	935
700–1000	1700	170
1–2 GHz	5000	990
2–4	6680	840
4–6	6850	310
6–8	3600	670
8–12	3500	1270
12–18	3500	360
18–40	2100	750

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 electrical and/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.

Conclusion

In view of the design features discussed for the Beech Model 58 Airplanes, the following special conditions are issued. This action is not a rule of general applicability and affects only those applicants who apply to the FAA for approval of these features on these airplanes.

The substance of these special conditions has been subject to the notice and public comment procedure in several prior rulemaking actions. For example, the Dornier 228–200 (53 FR 14782, April 26, 1988), the Cessna Model 525 (56 FR 49396, September 30, 1991), and the Beech Models 200, A200, and B200 airplanes (57 FR 1220, January 13, 1992). It is unlikely that additional public comment would result in any significant change from those special conditions already issued and commented on. For these reasons, and because a delay would significantly affect the applicant's installation of the system and 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 without notice. Therefore, these special conditions are being made effective upon publication in the Federal Register. However, as previously indicated, interested persons are invited to comment on these special conditions if they so desire.

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, 44701, 44702, and 44704; 14 CFR 21.16 and 21.101; and 14 CFR 11.28 and 11.49.

Adoption of 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 modified Beech Model 58 Airplanes:

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 14, 1995.

Dwight Young,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–28737 Filed 11–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 11

[Docket No. RM96–2–000; Order No. 584]

Correction of Annual Charges Formula

Issued November 14, 1995.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is amending its regulations governing the assessment of annual charges for the administration of Part I of the Federal Power Act (FPA). The amendment restores the *status quo ante* in the formulae for allocating annual charges among licensees, by correcting an error in a previous final rule.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 26, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barry Smoler, Officer of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 N. Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 208–1269.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the Federal Register, the Commission also provides all interested persons an opportunity to inspect or copy the contents of this document during normal business hours in Room 2A, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The Commission Issuance Posting System (CIPS), an electronic bulletin board service, provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission. CIPS is available at no charge to the user and may be accessed using a personal computer with a modem by dialing (800) 856–3920. To access CIPS, set your communications software to 19200, 14400, 12000, 9600, 7200, 4800, 2400 or 1200bps, full duplex, no parity, 8 data bits, and 1 stop bit. The full text of this document will be available on CIPS in ASCII and WordPerfect 5.1 format. The complete text on diskette in Wordperfect format may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, La Dorn Systems Corporation, located in Room 2A, 888 First St. NE., Washington, DC 20426.

I. Introduction and Background

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is amending its regulations governing the assessment of annual charges for the administration of Part I of the Federal Power Act (FPA).[1] The amendment restores the *status quo ante* in the formulae for allocating annual charges among licenses, by correcting an error in a previous final rule.

On March 15, 1995, the Commission issued Order No. 576, a final rule [2] that amended Part 11 of the Commission's regulations.[3] One provision of Order No. 576 amended § 11.1 of the regulations[4] by substituting (in several subsections) kilowatts for horsepower in stating a project's authorized installed capacity. The Commission explained that the change ''was designed to reflect modern usage in the rating of equipment used in hydropower projects.''[5]

Order No. 576 added a new § 11.1(i) that defined ''authorized installed capacity'' in terms of kilowatts (kW) and related electrical concepts and terminology. The definition included a conversion factor (multiply by 0.75 kW/hp) for converting the capacity of a turbine stated in horsepower (hp).

The formulae for allocating annual charges among non-municipal licensees were set forth in the section of the regulations that Order No. 576 renumbered as § 11.1(c)(3). Order No. 576 deleted all references in that subsection to ''horsepower,'' replacing them with references to ''authorized installed capacity.'' As explained above, ''authorized installed capacity'' was now defined in terms of kilowatts, not horsepower. In making this change, however, the Commission inadvertently neglected to include the horsepower to kilowatt conversion adjustment in that part of the renumbered §§ 11.1(c)(3) (i) and (iii) that referred to generation. The effect of that inadvertent omission was to seriously distort the balance of capacity and generation in determining the allocation of certain annual charges.[6] No such distortion was

[1] 16 U.S.C. 792–823b.

[2] III FERC Stats. & Regs. (Regulations Preambles) ¶ 31,016. Order No. 576 was published in the Federal Register on March 22, 1995, 60 FR 15040.

[3] 18 CFR Part 11.

[4] 18 CFR 11.1.

[5] III FERC Stats. & Regs. (Regulations Preambles) ¶ 31,016 at p. 31,303.

[6] There is no problem in the formula in § 11.1(c)(3)(ii), because that formula is based entirely on capacity. For the same reason, there is no problem in the assessment formula for municipal licensees (see paragraph (d) of that subsection), which is also based solely on capacity.