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 peak electrical strength, without the benefit of airplane structural shielding, in the frequency range of 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. Data used for engine certification may be used, when appropriate, for airplane certification.

2. *Electronic Engine Control System.* The installation of the electronic engine control system must comply with the requirements of § 23.1309(a) through (e) at Amendment 23–46. The intent of this requirement is not to re-evaluate the inherent hardware reliability of the control itself, but rather determine the effects, including environmental effects addressed in § 23.1309(e), on the airplane systems and engine control system when installing the control on the airplane. When appropriate, engine certification data may be used when showing compliance with this requirement.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on February 5, 2002.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 02–6131 Filed 3–13–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NM–166–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, and –83 Series Airplanes, and Model MD–88 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, and –83 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes. This proposal would require an inspection of the disconnect panel area above the aft left lavatory for chafed or damaged wires or unacceptable clearance between the wires and adjacent structure, and corrective actions, if necessary. This action is necessary to prevent chafing of wires at the disconnect panel above the aft left lavatory, which could result in electrical arcing, and consequent fire in the cabin. This action is intended to address the identified unsafe condition.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 29, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NM–166–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Comments may be submitted via fax to (425) 227–1232. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: *9-anm-nprmcomment@faa.gov.* Comments sent via fax or the Internet must contain ''Docket No. 2000–NM–166–AD'' in the subject line and need not be submitted in triplicate. Comments sent via the Internet as attached electronic files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Aircraft Group, Long Beach Division, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Data and Service Management, Dept. C1-L5A (D800–0024). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elvin Wheeler, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712–4137; telephone (562) 627–5344; fax (562) 627–5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this action may be changed in light of the comments received.

- Submit comments using the following format:
- Organize comments issue-by-issue. For example, discuss a request to change the compliance time and a request to change the service bulletin reference as two separate issues.
- For each issue, state what specific change to the proposed AD is being requested.
- Include justification (*e.g.,* reasons or data) for each request.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this action must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 2000–NM–166–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the

FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NM–166–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

As part of its practice of re-examining all aspects of the service experience of a particular aircraft whenever an accident occurs, the FAA has become aware of an incident of uncommanded deployment of the cabin oxygen masks on a McDonnell Douglas Model MD–88 airplane. This deployment occurred as the airplane was in flight climbing through 19,000 feet. The oxygen mask deployment was isolated to the aft lavatories, aft flight attendant seat, and passenger seats aft of the aft galley. No oxygen system/mask deployment cockpit indication lights illuminated. Inspection revealed 30 burnt wires in the area of a disconnect panel above the aft left lavatory. The burnt wires were attributed to chafing against the disconnect panel structure due to slack in the wires from the module blocks to a wire bundle riding against the disconnect panel. Additional inspections revealed two airplanes with chafed wires, three airplanes with wiring coming into contact with surrounding structure, and seven airplanes with slack wiring.

Chafing of wires at the disconnect panel above the aft left lavatory, if not corrected, could result in electrical arcing, and consequent fire in the cabin.

The disconnect panel above the aft left lavatory on certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, and –83 series airplanes is identical to that on the affected Model MD–88 airplanes. Therefore, all of these models may be subject to the same unsafe condition.

Other Relevant Rulemaking

The FAA, in conjunction with Boeing and operators of Model DC–9–81, –82, and –83 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes, is continuing to review all aspects of the service history of those airplanes to identify potential unsafe conditions and to take appropriate corrective actions. This proposed airworthiness directive (AD) is one of a series of actions identified during that process. The process is continuing and the FAA may consider additional rulemaking actions as further results of the review become available.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–24A184, including Appendix, dated October 26, 2000, which describes procedures for a general visual inspection of the disconnect panel area above the aft left lavatory for chafed or damaged wires or unacceptable clearance between the wires and adjacent structure; and corrective actions, if necessary. The corrective actions include securing wires using tie-wraps to obtain a 0.50-inch minimum clearance, and repairing or replacing any chafed or damaged wire with a new wire; as applicable. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin described previously.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 1,198 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 586 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $35,160, or $60 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this proposed AD were not adopted. The cost impact figures discussed in AD rulemaking actions represent only the time necessary to perform the specific actions actually required by the AD. These figures typically do not include incidental costs, such as the time required to gain access and close up, planning time, or time necessitated by other administrative actions. However, the FAA has been advised that manufacturer warranty remedies are available for some airplanes for labor costs associated with accomplishing the actions required by this proposed AD. Therefore, the future economic cost impact of this rule on U.S. operators may be less than the cost impact figure indicated above.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, it is determined that this proposal would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 2000–NM–166–AD.

Applicability: Model DC–9–81, –82, and –83 series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes; certificated in any category; as listed in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–24A184, dated October 26, 2000; equipped with Jamco lavatories.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (b) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by

this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent chafing of wires at the disconnect panel above the aft left lavatory, which could result in electrical arcing, and consequent fire in the cabin, accomplish the following:

Inspection and Corrective Action, If Necessary

(a) Within 120 days from the effective date of this AD, perform a general visual inspection of the disconnect panel area above the aft left lavatory for damaged or chafed wires or unacceptable clearance between the wires and structure, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–24A184, including Appendix, dated October 26, 2000.

Note 2: For the purposes of this AD, a general visual inspection is defined as: ''A visual examination of an interior or exterior area, installation, or assembly to detect obvious damage, failure, or irregularity. This level of inspection is made under normally available lighting conditions such as daylight, hangar lighting, flashlight, or drop-light, and may require removal or opening of access panels or doors. Stands, ladders, or platforms may be required to gain proximity to the area being checked.''

(1) Condition 1. If no damaged or chafed wire and if acceptable clearance (i.e., 0.50 inch minimum) between the wires and adjacent structure is found, no further action is required by this AD.

(2) Condition 2. If no chafed or damaged wire and if unacceptable clearance between the wires and adjacent structure is found, before further flight, secure wires using tie-wraps to obtain a 0.50-inch minimum clearance, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(3) Condition 3. If any chafed or damaged wire and unacceptable clearance between the wires and adjacent structure is found, before further flight, repair or replace any chafed or damaged wire with a new wire and secure wires using tie-wraps to obtain a 0.50-inch minimum clearance, in accordance with the service bulletin.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(b) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on March 7, 2002.

Vi L. Lipski,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 02–6097 Filed 3–13–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

48 CFR Part 252

[DFARS Case 2000–D029]

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Restriction on Contingent Fees for Foreign Military Sales—Commercial Items

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Proposed rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: DoD is proposing to amend the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to remove a clause from the list of clauses included in contracts for commercial items to implement provisions of law or Executive orders. The clause proposed for removal pertains to restrictions on contingent fees for foreign military sales.

DATES: Comments on the proposed rule should be submitted in writing to the address shown below on or before May 13, 2002, to be considered in the formation of the final rule.

ADDRESSES: Respondents may submit comments directly on the World Wide Web at *http://emissary.acq.osd.mil/dar/dfars.nsf/pubcomm*. As an alternative, respondents may e-mail comments to: *dfars@acq.osd.mil*. Please cite DFARS Case 2000–D029 in the subject line of e-mailed comments.

Respondents that cannot submit comments using either of the above methods may submit comments to: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Attn: Ms. Amy Williams, OUSD(AT&L)DP(DAR), IMD 3C132, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–3062; facsimile (703) 602–0350. Please cite DFARS Case 2000–D029.

At the end of the comment period, interested parties may view public comments on the World Wide Web at *http://emissary.acq.osd.mil/dar/dfars.nsf.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Amy Williams, (703) 602–0328.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

The clause at DFARS 252.212–7001, Contract Terms and Conditions Required to Implement Statutes or Executive Orders Applicable to Defense Acquisitions of Commercial Items, includes a list of clauses that may be included in a contract for commercial items to implement provisions of law or Executive orders. Included on the list is the clause at DFARS 252.225–7027, Restriction on Contingent Fees for Foreign Military Sales, which cites 22 U.S.C. 2779 as its statutory basis. However, the clause at DFARS 252.225–7027 does not implement 22 U.S.C. 2779, which requires in subsection (c) that no fee may be included in the amount paid under a contract unless the amount is reasonable, allocable, and not made to a person who has used improper influence. The clause at DFARS 252.225–7027 implements DoD policy only, requiring that, in order for the costs of certain contingent fees to be allowable, the Government must identify the fees and the foreign military sales customer must approve payment of the fees in writing before contract award. This requirement has little effect in commercial contracts where the price the Government pays is generally a fixed price, not based on cost analysis.

This rule was not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under Executive Order 12866, dated September 30, 1993.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The proposed rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*, because most firms that pay or receive contingent fees for foreign military sales are not small business concerns. Therefore, DoD has not performed an initial regulatory flexibility analysis. DoD invites comments from small businesses and other interested parties. DoD also will consider comments from small entities concerning the affected DFARS subpart in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 610. Such comments should be submitted separately and should cite DFARS Case 2000–D029.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because the rule does not impose any information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*