of product categories not included in the Analysis, and (4) information or evidence that bears on the adoption of ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1–1999 efficiency levels as uniform national standards under the terms of EPCA. The Department encourages those who wish to offer comments to obtain the Screening Analysis report and to address its contents. However, respondents need not limit their statements to the topics covered in the study, as the Department is interested in receiving views concerning any other issues that participants believe would affect the suitability of ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1–1999 efficiency standards for commercial water heaters, boilers, furnaces, air conditioners and heat pumps. For example, comments might include additional evidence, not uncovered in the Screening Analysis, bearing on the technological feasibility and economic justification of more stringent uniform national standards than those in ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1–1999 and on the significance of the energy conservation that would result from adopting them. Comments might also include evidence as to whether any standards more stringent than the ones specified in ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1–1999 are likely to result in unavailability in the United States of products with performance characteristics (including reliability), features, sizes, capacities and volumes that are substantially the same as those generally available in the United States now.

After the period for written comments, the Department will consider the views submitted in formulating rules regarding uniform energy efficiency standards for commercial water heaters, boilers, furnaces, air conditioners and heat pumps.

C. Public Workshop

1. Procedure for Submitting Requests To Speak

You will find the time and place of the public workshop listed at the beginning of this notice. We invite any person who has an interest in today's notice, or who is a representative of a group or class of persons that has an interest in these issues, to request an opportunity to make an oral presentation. If you would like to attend the public workshop, please notify Ms. Brenda Edwards-Jones at (202) 586–2945. You may hand deliver requests to speak to the address indicated at the beginning of this notice between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, or you may send them by mail.

The person making the request should state why he or she, either individually or as a representative of a group or class of persons, is an appropriate spokesperson; briefly describe the nature of the interest in the proceeding; and provide a telephone number for contact. We request each person selected to be heard to submit an advance copy of his or her statement at least one week prior to the date of this workshop as indicated at the beginning of this notice. We, at our discretion, may permit any person wishing to speak who cannot meet this requirement to participate if that person has made alternative arrangements with the Office of Building Research and Standards in advance. The letter making a request to give an oral presentation must ask for such alternative arrangements.

2. Conduct of Workshop

We will conduct the workshop in an informal, conference style. We may use a professional facilitator to facilitate discussion, and a court reporter will record the transcript of the meeting. We will present summaries of comments received before the workshop, allow time for presentations by workshop participants, and encourage all interested parties to share their views on issues affecting this proceeding. The comment period closes on July 31, 2000 in order to allow interested parties an opportunity to comment on the matters raised at the workshop, as well as on any other aspect of the proceeding. The public workshop agenda is expected to cover the topics listed in the preceding Section III. B., Issues on Which Comments Are Requested.

We will arrange for a transcript of the workshop and will make the entire record of this proceeding, including the transcript, available for inspection in the Department's Freedom of Information Reading Room. Any person may purchase a copy of the transcript from the transcribing reporter.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 8, 2000.

Dan W. Reicher,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 00–12112 Filed 5–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. CE161; Notice No. 23–00–02–SC]

Special Conditions: Installation of Full Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC) System on Morrow Aircraft Corporation Model MB–300 Airplane

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed special conditions.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes special conditions for the Morrow Aircraft Corporation Model MB–300, which will use a FADEC System. This airplane will have a novel or unusual design feature associated with the installation of an engine that uses an electronic engine control system in place of the engine's mechanical system. The applicable airworthiness regulations do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for this design feature. These proposed special conditions contain the additional safety standards that the Administrator considers necessary to establish a level of safety equivalent to that established by the existing airworthiness standards.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 14, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this proposal may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE–7, Attention: Rules Docket, Docket No. CE161, DOT Building, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, or delivered in duplicate to the Regional Counsel at the above address. Comments must be marked: Docket No. CE161. Comments may be inspected in the Rules Docket weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randy Griffith, Aerospace Engineer, Federal Aviation Administration, Aircraft Certification Service, Small Airplane Directorate, ACE–111, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri, 816–329–4126, fax 816–329–4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of these proposed special conditions by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the

regulatory docket or notice 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. The proposals described in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received. All comments received will be available in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons, 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 notice must include with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. CE161.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On March 5, 1999, Morrow Aircraft Corporation applied for a type certificate for the Model MB–300 airplane. The Model MB–300 is a small, normal category airplane. The airplane is powered by two reciprocating engines equipped with an electronic engine control system with full authority capability in place of the hydromechanical control system.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.17, Morrow Aircraft Corporation must show that the Model MB–300 meets the applicable provisions of 14 CFR part 23, as amended by Amendments 23–1 through 23–53 thereto.

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 23) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model MB–300 because of a novel or unusual design feature, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of § 21.16.

In addition to the applicable airworthiness regulations and special conditions, the Model MB–300 must comply with the fuel vent and exhaust emission requirements of 14 CFR part 34 and the noise certification requirements of 14 CFR part 36, and the FAA must issue a finding of regulatory adequacy pursuant to section 611 of Public Law 92–574, the ''Noise Control Act of 1972.''

Special conditions, as appropriate, are issued in accordance with § 11.49 after public notice, as required by §§ 11.28 and 11.29(b), and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.17(a)(2).

Special conditions are initially applicable to the model for which they are issued. Should the type certificate for that model be amended later to include any other model that incorporates the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would also apply to the other model under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

Novel or Unusual Design Features

The Morrow Model MB–300 will incorporate the following novel or unusual design features:

The Morrow Model MB–300 airplane will use engines that include an electronic control system with full engine authority capability.

Many advanced electronic systems are prone to either upsets or damage, or both, at energy levels lower than analog systems. The increasing use of high power radio frequency emitters mandates requirements for improved high intensity radiated fields (HIRF) protection for electrical and electronic equipment. Since the electronic engine control system used on the Morrow Model MB–300 will perform critical functions, provisions for protection from the effects of HIRF fields should be considered and, if necessary, incorporated into the airplane design data. The FAA policy contained in Notice 8110.71, dated April 2, 1998, establishes the HIRF energy levels that airplanes will be exposed to in service. The guidelines set forth in this Notice are the result of an Aircraft Certification Service review of existing policy on HIRF, in light of the ongoing work of the ARAC Electromagnetic Effects Harmonization Working Group (EEHWG). The EEHWG adopted a set of HIRF environment levels in November 1997 that were agreed upon by the FAA, JAA, and industry participants. As a result, the HIRF environments in this notice reflect the environment levels recommended by this working group. This notice states that a full authority digital engine control is an example of a system that should address the HIRF environments.

Even though the control system will be certificated as part of the engine, the installation of an engine with an electronic control system requires evaluation due to the possible effects on or by other airplane systems (*e.g.,* radio interference with other airplane electronic systems, shared engine and airplane power sources). The regulatory requirements in 14 CFR part 23 for evaluating the installation of complex systems, including electronic systems, are contained in § 23.1309. However, when § 23.1309 was developed, the use of electronic control systems for engines was not envisioned; therefore, the § 23.1309 requirements were not applicable to systems certificated as part of the engine (reference § 23.1309(f)(1)). Also, electronic control systems often require inputs from airplane data and power sources and outputs to other airplane systems (*e.g.,* automated cockpit powerplant controls such as mixture setting). Although the parts of the system that are not certificated with the engine could be evaluated using the criteria of § 23.1309, the integral nature of systems such as these makes it unfeasible to evaluate the airplane portion of the system without including the engine portion of the system. However, § 23.1309(f)(1) again prevents complete evaluation of the installed airplane system since evaluation of the engine system's effects is not required.

Therefore, special conditions are proposed for the Morrow Model MB–300 to provide HIRF protection and to evaluate the installation of the electronic engine control system for compliance with the requirements of § 23.1309(a) through (e) at Amendment 23–53.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the Morrow Model MB–300. Should Morrow Aircraft Corporation apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would apply to that model as well under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on one model, the Morrow Model MB–300 airplane. It is not a rule of general applicability, and it affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on the airplane.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 23

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Signs and symbols.

Authority: The authority citation for these special conditions in part 23 is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113 and 44701; 14 CFR 21.16 and 21.17, and 14 CFR 11.28 and 11.29(b).

The Proposed Special Conditions

Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes the following special conditions as part of the type certification basis for Morrow Model MB–300 airplane.

1. High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF) Protection. In showing

compliance with 14 CFR part 21 and the airworthiness requirements of 14 CFR part 23, protection against hazards caused by exposure to HIRF fields for the full authority digital engine control system which performs critical functions, must be considered. To prevent this occurrence, the electronic engine control system must be designed and installed to ensure that the operation and operational capabilities of this critical system are not adversely affected when the airplane is exposed to high energy radio fields.

At this time, the FAA and other airworthiness authorities are unable to precisely define or control the HIRF energy level to which the airplane will be exposed in service; therefore, the FAA hereby defines two acceptable interim methods for complying with the requirement for protection of systems that perform critical functions.

(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 external HIRF threat environment defined in the following table:

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 items that affect the electronic engine control system must comply with the requirements of § 23.1309(a) through (e) including applicable amendments through Amendment 23–53. Data used for engine certification may be used, when appropriate, for airplane certification.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on April 28, 2000.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–12142 Filed 5–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD05–98–090]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Elizabeth River, Eastern Branch, Norfolk, VA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard has revised its proposal to change the regulations governing the operation of the Norfolk and Western Railroad drawbridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River, mile 2.7, at Norfolk, Virginia. The revised proposal would require on-signal openings from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. using a half-cycle draw operation and would reduce the advance notice required at other times from 3 hours to 2 hours. This change would provide for the reasonable needs of navigation.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before July 14, 2000.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to the Commander (Aowb), Fifth Coast Guard District, Federal Building, 4th Floor, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704–5004, or they may be hand-delivered to the same address between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Commander (Aowb), Fifth Coast Guard District maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann Deaton, Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, (757) 398–6222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD05–98–090), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 81/2 by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Commander (Aowb), Fifth Coast Guard District at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Regulatory History

On November 2, 1998, the Coast Guard published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NRPM) entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Elizabeth River, Eastern Branch, Norfolk, Virginia'' in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 58676). We also distributed local notice of the **Federal Register** publication. We received 652 comments on the proposed rule. Most of the comments included a request for a public hearing, but based on the number of comments and the issues addressed by the comments, we determined that a public hearing would not provide additional information to aid the rulemaking process.

Background and Purpose

The Norfolk and Western Railroad drawbridge is owned and operated by Norfolk Southern Corporation (NSC). The regulations at 33 CFR 117.1007(a)