

the subject of the AC, and submit comments in duplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service before issuance of the final AC.

### Background

The AC is on the subject of engine vibration tests and surveys, and was identified as one where differences existed between the Joint Aviation Requirements—Engines, and part 33 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. A study group composed of representatives of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Joint Aviation Authorities, Transport Canada and industry worked to produce a set of improved and harmonized requirements that was subsequently incorporated into part 33 of the FAR. This AC is intended to provide guidance in implementing these new harmonized requirements during certification.

These requirements have been published as a notice of proposed rulemaking in the **Federal Register** on March 16, 1995.

This advisory circular, published under the authority granted to the Administrator by 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423, provides guidance for these proposed requirements,

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on April 7, 1995.

**James C. Jones,**

*Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
[FR Doc. 95-9503 Filed 4-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

### Airborne Weather Radar With Forward-Looking Windshear Capability

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the availability of and request comments on a proposed technical standard order (TSO) pertaining to airborne weather radar with forward-looking windshear capability. The proposed TSO prescribes the minimum performance standards that airborne weather radar with forward-looking windshear capability must meet to be identified with the marking "TSO-C134."

**DATES:** Comments must identify the TSO file number and be received on or before July 20, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send all comments on the proposed technical standard order to: Technical Program and Continued Airworthiness Branch, AIR-120, Aircraft Engineering Division, Aircraft Certification Service—File No. TSO-C134, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. Or deliver comments to: Federal Aviation Administration, Room 804, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Bobbie J. Smith, Technical Program and Continued Airworthiness Branch, AIR-120, Aircraft Engineering Division, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267-9546.

### Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed TSO listed in this notice by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they desire to the above specified address. Comments received on the proposed technical standard order may be examined, before and after the comment closing date, in Room 804, FAA Headquarters Building (FOB-10A), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, weekdays except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments specified above will be considered by the Director of the Aircraft Certification Service before issuing the final TSO.

### Background

This is a new TSO that sets forth minimum operational performance standards for airborne weather radar with forward-looking windshear detection capability.

For windshear detection, the airborne radar equipment must detect areas containing windshear activity. It must be capable of correlating and generating appropriate alerts based on F factor. This output must be clear, automatic, concise and distinct to allow for rapid pilot interpretation. The selection of the windshear detection mode must be done automatically during takeoff and landing phases of flight.

This TSO contains standards for weather detection and ground mapping. In the case of weather detection, the airborne radar equipment must detect and display echoes from precipitation in a way that will allow flight crew analysis of probable turbulent areas ahead. In the case of ground mapping,

the airborne radar equipment must be able to detect and display echoes from the surface of the earth to allow in-flight analysis.

### How to Obtain Copies

A copy of the proposed TSO-C134 may be obtained by contacting **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** Copies of RTCA Document No. DO-220, "Minimum Operational Performance Standards for Airborne Weather Radar with Forward-Looking Windshear Capability," may be purchased from the RTCA Inc., 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 1020, Washington, DC 20036.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 12, 1995.

**John K. McGrath,**

*Manager, Aircraft Engineering Division Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 95-9502 Filed 4-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

### Aircraft Flight Recorder and Cockpit Voice Recorder

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Cancellation of Technical Standard Orders (TSO's) C51a and C84.

**SUMMARY:** This notice cancels TSO-C51a, Aircraft Flight Recorder and TSO-C84, Cockpit Voice Recorder. TSO-C51a prescribes the minimum performance standards that aircraft flight recorders were required to be identified with marking "TSO-C51a," dated January 6, 1966. TSO-C84 prescribes the minimum performance standards that cockpit voice recorders (CVR) were required to be identified with marking "TSO-C84." This cancellation will ensure that future flight recorders and cockpit voice recorders are produced under TSO-C123a, Cockpit Voice Recorder System, and TSO-C124a, Flight Data Recorder Systems.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 18, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Bobbie J. Smith, Technical Programs and Continued Airworthiness Branch, AIR-120, Aircraft Engineering Division, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267-9546.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

The National Transportation Safety Board reported that seven flight recorder media destroyed by postimpact fire in

six accidents prompted concern about the adequacy of the performance standards for flight recorders. Minimum performance standards for impact and fire protection are outlined in four Technical Standard Orders (TSO's): TSO-C84 and TSO-C123 address CVR's and TSO-C51a and TSO-C124 address FDR's. TSO-C51a and TSO-C84 have essentially the same fire protection requirements; the fire test protocol requirements outlined in these TSO's are less stringent than the requirements outlined in the recently issued TSO-C123 and C124. Further, the fire test protocol in TSO-C51a and C84 is so vague that a recorder could be subjected to temperatures much lower than 1,100 °C due to inadequate burner heat release and still pass the test. The FAA recognized this deficiency in its 1970 report, "Fire Test Criteria for Recorders." The report states:

"This requirement [TSO-C51a/C84] specifies the temperature, but not the source or the BTU rate of the flame. The temperature at the recorder flame impingement area must be 1,100 °C (2,012 °F). Thus, a recorder could meet the TSO requirements by passing a test in which the recorder is exposed to low heat output flames producing a temperature of 1,100 °C at a point of a few inches in front of the recorder while the temperature at the recorder case could be much less than 1,100 °C."

The temperature and duration for the fire test required by TSO's C51a, C84, C123, and C124 are the same. However, only the more exacting test protocol prescribed by TSO-C124 is likely to determine if a recorder will actually survive a high intensity, short duration fire.

Based on the findings of the NTSB, TSO-C54a and TSO-C81 are canceled May 18, 1995. Because of the need to ensure that the data, cockpit voice described above, is preserved, good cause exists to cancel TSO's C51a and C84 without prior notice and opportunity to comment.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 12, 1995.

**John K. McGrath,**

*Manager, Aircraft Engineering Division,  
Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 95-9501 Filed 4-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 92-58; Notice 4]

### Kewet Industri; Grant of Application for Renewal of Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208

Kewet Industri of Hadsund, Denmark, applied for a two-year renewal of its temporary exemption from the automatic restraint requirements of Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*. The exemption, NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. 93-1, was published on February 10, 1993 (58 FR 7905). The basis of the application was that a continued exemption would facilitate the development and field evaluation of a low-emission motor vehicle and would not unreasonably lower the safety level of the vehicle.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on January 12, 1995, and an opportunity afforded for comment (60 FR 3026).

Kewet manufactures a passenger car called the El-Jet. The vehicle is powered by on-board rechargeable batteries which drive an electric traction motor. The El-Jet, which produces no emissions, is therefore a "low-emission motor vehicle" within the meaning of NHTSA's authority to provide temporary exemptions.

In 1992, Kewet argued that the granting of a temporary exemption would facilitate the development of an electric vehicle industry in the United States. The vehicle is so small that it could serve as a replacement for the 3-wheel Cushman type meter reader vehicle in municipal fleets. It provides greater safety for the operator at a substantially lower price. Further, an exemption would promote learning and exchange of information between the Danish electric vehicle industry and the U.S. one. Finally, the El Jet would demonstrate the commercial viability of a "neighborhood electric vehicle."

Petitioner also argued that an exemption would not unreasonably degrade the safety of the vehicle. The El-Jet is equipped with a 3-point restraint system, and will otherwise comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards. It complies with all current European motor safety standards and has passed a crash test at 50 kph (30 mph). Its top speed is only 40 mph, reducing the risk of injury. Although Kewet expected to be able to provide a driver's side air bag in all cars manufactured after September 1993, the target date is now the 1996 model year. Originally, Kewet projected sales of 30

to 50 vehicles through 1993; in actuality, sales in 1994 as of August 30 were "less than 35."

In Kewet's opinion, a temporary exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with traffic safety objectives because it is a participant in the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) Electrical Vehicle Testing Program. It comments that "[p]roviding test data to the national testing program \* \* \* is an important development to the electric vehicle industry." Kewet does not feel that lack of an air bag "has been a safety hazard" because of the El-Jet's low top speed, and intended non-freeway use. The vehicle is equipped with lap and torso belts, and employs "steel roll cage construction."

No comments were received in response to the notice.

While the application was pending, NHTSA asked Kewet to provide further information on the 50 kph crash test to which it had referred. Kewet supplied a copy of a test report by TNO laboratory of Delft, the Netherlands, and a video of the test. The test was conducted to the requirements of ECE R-12 in 1990, and indicates conformance. The El Jet also passed the body block tests at 24.1 kph on the steering wheel, according to the requirements of ECE-12. Kewet confirmed to NHTSA that it will install both a driver and passenger airbag "before the end of 1995."

With respect to the three-point belt system that has been and will be provided in the interim, Kewet submitted a report on its seat belt anchorages by the Danish Technology Institute verifying compliance with E.E.C. Regulation 76/115/E.E.C. These reports have provided NHTSA with the assurance necessary to find that an exemption would not unreasonably lower the safety level of the car. NHTSA notes, too, that the vehicle is certified as complying with all other Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Although Kewet's market in the U.S. has been extremely limited under its exemption, the El Jet is one of the few exempted vehicles of foreign manufacture, and one which is a purpose-built electric vehicle and not a conversion. Thus, to extend the exemption would enhance the evaluation of electric vehicles under U.S. road conditions. The public interest will be served by the continued participation of the El Jet in ARPA's electric vehicle test program.

Although a one-year extension would appear to be sufficient for Kewet, the agency is providing one of 18 months in the event that unforeseen delays are