only able to harvest 200,000 pounds. Your indemnity would be calculated as follows:

(1) 100 acres × 4,000 pounds = 400,000 pounds guarantee;
(2) 400,000 pounds × $0.09 price election = $36,000.00 value of guarantee;
(4) 200,000 pounds × $0.09 price election = $18,000.00 value of production to count;
(6) $36,000.00 − $18,000.00 = $18,000.00 loss; and
(7) $18,000.00 × 100 percent = $18,000.00 indemnity payment.

You also have a 100 percent share in 100 acres of pod type green peas in the same unit, with a guarantee of 5,000 pounds per acre and a price election of $0.13 per pound. You are only able to harvest 450,000 pounds. Your total indemnity for both shell type and pod type green peas would be calculated as follows:

(1) 100 acres × 4,000 pounds = 400,000 pounds guarantee for the shell type, and 100 acres × 5,000 pounds = 500,000 pounds guarantee for the pod type;
(2) 400,000 pounds guarantee × $0.09 price election = $36,000.00 value of guarantee for the shell type, and 500,000 pounds guarantee × $0.13 price election = $65,000.00 value of guarantee for the pod type;
(3) $36,000.00 + $65,000.00 = $101,000.00 total value of guarantee;
(4) 200,000 pounds × $0.09 price election = $18,000.00 value of production to count for the shell type, and
450,000 pounds × $0.13 = $58,500.00 value of production to count for the pod type;
(5) $18,000.00 + $58,500.00 = $76,500.00 total value of production to count;
(6) $101,000.00 − $76,500.00 = $24,500.00 loss; and
(7) $24,500.00 loss × 100 percent = $24,500.00 indemnity payment.

(c) The total production to count, specified in pounds, from all insurable acreage on the unit will include:

(1) All appraised production as follows:

(i) Not less than the production guarantee for acreage:

(A) That is abandoned;

(B) That is put to another use without our consent;

(C) That is damaged solely by uninsured causes or;

(D) For which you fail to provide production records that are acceptable to us.

(ii) Production lost due to uninsured causes.

(iii) Production on acreage that is bypassed unless the acreage was bypassed due to an insured cause of loss which resulted in production which would not be acceptable under the terms of the processor contract.

(iv) Potential production on insured acreage that you intend to put to another use or abandon, if you and we agree on the appraised amount of production. Upon such agreement, the insurance period for that acreage will end when you put the acreage to another use or abandon the crop. If agreement on the appraised amount of production is not reached:

(A) If you do not elect to continue to care for the crop, we may give you consent to put the acreage to another use if you agree to leave intact, and provide sufficient care for, representative samples of the crop in locations acceptable to us (The amount of production to count for such acreage will be based on the harvested production or appraisals from the samples at the time harvest should have occurred. If you do not leave the required samples intact, or fail to provide sufficient care for the samples, our appraisal made prior to giving you consent to put the acreage to another use will be used to determine the amount of production to count); or

(B) If you elect to continue to care for the crop, the amount of production to count for the acreage will be the harvested production, or our reappraisal if additional damage occurs and the crop is not harvested.

(2) All harvested green pea production from the insurable acreage. The amount of such production will be determined by dividing the dollar amount paid, payable, or which should have been paid under the terms of the processor contract for the quality and quantity of the peas delivered to the processor by the base contract price per pound;

(3) All harvested green pea production from any of your other insurable units that have been used to fulfill your processor contract for this unit; and

(4) All dry pea production from the insurable acreage if you gave notice in accordance with section 11(d) for any acreage you intended to harvest as dry peas. The harvested or appraised dry pea production will be multiplied by 1.667 for shell types and 3.000 for pod types to determine the green pea production equivalent. No adjustment for quality deficiencies will be allowed for dry pea production.

13. Late and Prevented Planting.

Late planting provisions are not applicable to green peas unless allowed by the Special Provisions and you provide written approval from the processor by the acreage reporting date that it will accept the production from the late planted acres when it is expected to be ready for harvest. Prevented planting coverage will be available if contained in the Basic Provisions.

14. Written Agreement.

Terms of this policy that are specifically designated for the use of written agreements may be altered by written agreement in accordance with the following:

(a) You must apply in writing for each written agreement no later than the sales closing date, except as provided in section 14(e);

(b) The application for a written agreement must contain all variable terms of the contract between you and us that will be in effect if the written agreement is not approved;

(c) If approved, the written agreement will include all variable terms of the contract, including, but not limited to, crop type or variety, the guarantee, premium rate, and price election;

(d) Each written agreement will only be valid for one year (if the written agreement is not specifically renewed the following year, insurance coverage for subsequent crop years will be in accordance with the printed policy); and

(e) An application for a written agreement submitted after the sales closing date may be approved if, after a physical inspection of the acreage, it is determined that no loss has occurred and the crop is insurable in accordance with the policy and written agreement provisions.

Signed in Washington, D.C., on October 23, 1997.

Kenneth D. Ackerman,

Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

[FR Doc. 97–30514 Filed 11–19–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. 141CE, Special Condition 23–ACE–92]

Special Conditions; Cessna Model 525 Citation Jet Airplane

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: These special conditions are issued to Rockwell Collins, Inc., 400 Collins Road NE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52498 for a Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) on the Cessna Model 525 Citation Jet airplane. This airplane 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 November 20, 1997. Comments must be received on or before December 22, 1997.

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. 141CE, Room 1558, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. All comments must be marked: Docket No. 141CE. 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 condition 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. 141CE.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On March 26, 1997, Rockwell Collins, Inc., 400 Collins Road NE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52498 made an application to the FAA for a Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) for the Cessna Model 525 Citation Jet airplane. 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 Cessna Model 525 Citation Jet airplane is given in Type Certification Data Sheet No. A1WI plus the following: 14 CFR Part 23, as amended by 23–1 through 23–38, and 23–40; 14 CFR Part 36, effective December 1, 1969, as amended by 36–1 through 36–18; 14 CFR Part 34 effective September 10, 1990; compliance with the Noise Control Act of 1972; Special Condition 23–ACE–55; and Exemption 5759 for type certification utilizing the directional damping criterion of 14 CFR Part 25, § 25.181, in lieu of the damping criterion of § 23.181(b).

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).

Rockwell Collins, 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 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 previously 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	30
200–400	70	70
400–700	700	80
700–1000	1700	240
1–2 GHz	5000	360
2–4	4500	360
4–6	7200	300
6–8	2000	330
8–12	3500	270
12–18	3500	330
18–40	780	20

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 Cessna Model 525 Citation Jet airplane, 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 Model 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 Cessna Model 525 Citation Jet 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 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 October 28, 1997.

Mary Ellen A. Schutt,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–30495 Filed 11–19–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–CE–05–AD; Amendment 39–10207; AD 97–23–17]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company 90, 100, 200, and 300 Series Airplanes (Formerly Known as Beech Aircraft Corporation 90, 100, 200, and 300 Series Airplanes)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to Raytheon Aircraft Company (Raytheon) 90, 100, 200, and 300 series airplanes. This action requires inspecting gray, blue, or clear Ethylene Vinyl Acetate (EVA) tubing near the co-pilot's foot warmer for collapse or deformity. If the tubing is collapsed or deformed, this action requires replacing and re-routing the tubing. This EVA tubing is used on the pneumatic de-ice indicator lines and the pressurization control system pneumatic lines that provide vacuum to the outflow safety valves that depressurize the airplane. This action is the result of several reports of collapsed EVA tubing. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent a loss of vacuum to depressurize the airplane cabin, which could result in personal injury to the door operator; and to prevent malfunction of the de-ice indicator system, which could cause the pilot to immediately exit icing conditions.

DATES: Effective December 29, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 29, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from Raytheon Aircraft Company, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201–0085. This information may also be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket 97–CE–05–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike Imbler, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-