P/N 204–011–450–007 or P/N 204–011–450–105—15,000 hours TIS or 300,000 RIN, whichever occurs first.

P/N 204–011–450–113 or P/N 204–011–450–119—13,000 hours TIS or 275,000 RIN, whichever occurs first.

Trunnions: P/N 204–011–105–001—15,000 hours TIS or 300,000 RIN, whichever occurs first.

P/N 204–011–105–103—13,000 hours TIS or 275,000 RIN, whichever occurs first.

(h) The actions shall be done in accordance with:

- Bell Helicopter Textron Alert Service Bulletin No. 205–90–40, Revision A, dated March 21, 1991, which is applicable to Model 205A and 205A–1 helicopters;
- Bell Helicopter Textron Alert Service Bulletin No. 205B–90–1, Revision A, dated March 21, 1991, which is applicable to Model 205B helicopters; and
- Bell Helicopter Textron Alert Service Bulletin No. 212–90–64, Revision B, dated March 11, 1992, which is applicable to Model 212 helicopters.

This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc., P.O. Box 482, Fort Worth, Texas 76101, telephone (817) 280–3391, fax (817) 280–6466. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Room 663, Fort Worth, Texas; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(i) This amendment becomes effective on December 8, 1998.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on November 13, 1998.

**Henry A. Armstrong,**

*Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 98–31195 Filed 11–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## 14 CFR Part 71

**[Airspace Docket No. 98–ANM–17]**

## Amendment of Class E Airspace; Grand Junction, CO

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action amends the Grand Junction, CO, Class E airspace by providing additional controlled airspace to accommodate the development of a new Standard Instrument Approach Procedure (SIAP) utilizing the Global Positioning System (GPS) at Walker Field Airport.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** 0901 UTC, January 28, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dennis Ripley, ANM–520.6, Federal Aviation Administration, Docket No. 98–ANM–17, 1601 Lind Avenue S.W., Renton, Washington, 98055–4056; telephone number: (425) 227–2527.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### History

On September 14, 1998, the FAA proposed to amend Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, part 71 (14 CFR part 71) by revising the Grand Junction, CO, Class E airspace area (63 FR 49052). This revision provides the additional airspace necessary to encompass the new GPS Runway 11 and the GPS Runway 29 SIAPs to the Walker Field Airport, Grand Junction, CO. This amendment adds a small Class E area extension to the present airspace in order to accommodate a slightly larger flying area for the SIAPs. In the notice of proposed rulemaking action, the coordinates for the Grand Junction Localizer were inadvertently left out of the legal description for Grand Junction. This error is corrected herein. Interested parties were invited to participate in the rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal. No comments were received.

The coordinates for this airspace docket are based on North American Datum 83. Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth are published in Paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9F, dated September 10, 1998, and effective September 16, 1998, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designation listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

### The Rule

This amendment to 14 CFR part 71 modifies Class E airspace at Grand Junction, CO, by providing the additional airspace necessary to fully contain new flight procedures at Walker Field Airport. This modification of airspace adds a small Class E area extension to the present airspace in order to accommodate a slightly larger flying area for the SIAPs. The intended effect of this rule is designed to provide safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace and to promote safe flight operations under Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) at the Walker Field Airport and between the terminal and en route transition stages.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore, (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

### Adoption of the Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

## PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, CLASS B, CLASS C, CLASS D, AND CLASS E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIRWAYS; ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9F, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 10, 1998, and effective September 16, 1998, is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.*

* * * * *

**ANM CO E5 Grand Junction, CO [Revised]**

Grand Junction, Walker Field, CO
(Lat. 39°07′21″N, long. 108°31′36″W)
Grand Junction VORTAC
(Lat. 39°03′34″N, long. 108°47′33″W)
Grand Junction Localizer
(Lat. 39°07′04″N, long. 108°30′48″W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within 7 miles northwest and 4.3 miles southeast of the Grand Junction VORTAC 247° and 067° radials extending from 11.4 miles southwest to 12.3 miles northeast of the VORTAC, and within 1.8 miles south and 9.2 miles north of the Grand Junction VORTAC 110° radial extending from the VORTAC to 19.2 miles southeast; that airspace extending upward from 1,200 feet above the surface within a 30.5 mile radius of the Grand Junction VORTAC, within 4.3 miles each side of the Grand Junction VORTAC 166° radial

extending from the 30.5-mile radius to 33.1 miles south of the VORTAC, and within 4.3 miles northeast and 4.9 miles southwest of the Grand Junction ILS localizer northwest course extending from the 30.5-mile radius to the intersection of the localizer northwest course and the Grand Junction VORTAC 318° radial.

* * * * *

Issued in Seattle, Washington, on November 12, 1998.

**Glenn A. Adams III,**

*Assistant Manager, Air Traffic Division, Northwest Mountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 98–31214 Filed 11–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

## 16 CFR Part 436

## Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising and Business Opportunity Ventures

**AGENCY:** Federal Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Grant of petition for exemption.

**SUMMARY:** On April 16, 1998, the Commission published a notice in the **Federal Register** soliciting comments on a petition filed by Navistar International Transportation Corporation. The Commission now grants the petition and determines that the provisions of 16 CFR Part 436 shall not apply to the advertising, offering, licensing, contracting, sale or other promotion of truck dealerships by Navistar International Transportation Corporation.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 23, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Myra Howard, Attorney, PC–H–238, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 326–2047.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Before the Federal Trade Commission

Order Granting Exemption In the Matter of a Petition for Exemption from the Trade Regulation. Rule Entitled ''Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising and Business Opportunity Ventures'' Filed by Navistar International Transportation Corporation.

On April 16, 1998, the Commission published a notice in the **Federal Register** soliciting comments on a petition filed by Navistar International Transportation Corporation (''Navistar''). Navistar manufactures heavy-duty and medium-duty trucks, truck parts, and military tractors, and enters into distributorship agreements with businesspeople throughout the United States to sell and service Navistar's trucks and parts. The petition sought an exemption, pursuant to Section 18(g) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, from coverage under the Commission's Trade Regulation Rule entitled ''Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising and Business Opportunity Ventures'' (''Franchise Rule'').

In accordance with Section 18(g), the Commission conducted an exemption proceeding under Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553, and invited public comment during a 60-day period ending June 15, 1998. No comments were received. After reviewing the petition, the Commission has concluded that the Petitioner's request should be granted.

The statutory standard for exemption requires the Commission to determine whether application of the Trade Regulation Rule to the person or class of persons seeking exemption is ''necessary to prevent the unfair or deceptive act or practice to which the rule relates.'' If not, an exemption is warranted.

The abuses that the disclosure remedy of the Franchise Rule is designed to prevent are most likely to occur, as the Statement of Basis and Purpose of the Rule notes, in sales where three factors are present:

(1) A potential investor has a relative lack of business experience and sophistication;

(2) The investor has inadequate time to review and comprehend the unique and often complex terms of the franchise agreement before making a major financial commitment; and

(3) A significant information imbalance exists in which the prospective franchisee is unable to obtain essential and relevant facts known to the franchisor about the investment.

The pre-sale disclosures required by the Franchise Rule are designed to negate the effect of any deceptive acts or practices where these conditions are present. The Rule requires franchisors to provide investors with the material information they need to make an informed investment decision in circumstances where they might otherwise lack the resources, knowledge, or ability to obtain the information, and thus protect themselves from deception.

Where the conditions that create a potential for deception in the sale of franchises are not present, however, a regulatory remedy designed to prevent deception is unnecessary. Our review of the record in this proceeding persuades us that an exemption is warranted for that reason. The Petitioner has convincingly shown that the conditions that create a potential for a pattern or practice of abuse are absent; thus, there is no likelihood of unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the appointment of its truck dealership franchises.

The petition demonstrates that potential Navistar dealers are and will continue to be a select group of highly sophisticated and experienced businesspeople; that they make very significant investments; and that they have more than adequate time to consider the dealership offer and obtain information about it before investing. We not in particular that Navistar has only about 450 dealers; that prospective Navistar dealers usually have years of experience in truck or other heavy duty equipment sales; that investment costs for Navistar dealerships are approximately $1 million; and that prospective dealers participate in an extensive application and approval process, lasting anywhere from four months to a year, during which time a good deal of information is exchanged between the parties.

As a practical matter, investments of this size and scope typically involve knowledgeable investors, the use of independent business and legal advisors, and an extended period of negotiation that generates the exchange of information necessary to ensure that investment decisions are the product of an informed assessment of the potential risks and benefits. The Commission has reviewed the potential for unfair or deceptive acts or practices in connection with the licensing of motor vehicle dealership franchises on eight prior occasions since 1980, and found no evidence or likelihood of a significant pattern or practice of abuse by any of the Petitioners. If any such evidence exists, it has not yet been brought to the Commission's attention in this or any of the prior proceedings.

Thus, both the record in this proceeding and all prior experience to date with other Franchise Rule exemptions for automobile dealerships support the conclusion that Petitioner's licensing of new truck dealers accomplishes what the Rule was intended to ensure. The conditions most likely to lead to abuses are not present in the licensing of Navistar dealerships, and the process generates sufficient information to ensure that applicants will be able to make an informed investment decision. For these reasons, the Commission finds that the application of the Franchise Rule to Petitioner's licensing of truck dealer