

1986) the Commission provided for a transition in implementing some of the rule changes affecting WATS resellers.

2. The transition was adopted as a result of the Commission's concern that a flash-cut change could have an adverse impact on WATS resellers who might find it necessary to reconfigure their networks as a result of the rule changes. The FCC was concerned that it might be difficult to accomplish such reconfigurations by June 1, 1986, in light of possible time delays in processing orders for alternative facilities, as well as uncertainty about the size of AT&T's WATS rate reductions resulting from the First Report and Order. Thus, the transition provided a limited exception to the June 1, 1986, effective date for applying access charges to the access lines used by WATS resellers. Under the transition, WATS resellers were excused from paying Carrier Common Line Charges (CCLCs) until January 1, 1987, for traffic carried on resold WATS lines already in service as of March 13, 1986 but were still required to begin paying all traffic-sensitive access charges for such traffic as of June 1, 1986.

3. The Commission rejects in this Memorandum Opinion and Order US West's request that it eliminate the resellers' transition. US West argued that AT&T's WATS rate reduction obviated the need for the transition by eliminating the possibility that resellers would effectively be paying CCLCs twice on the originating end of their calls. The FCC determines that only after June 1, 1986, when modified WATS rates went into effect, could WATS resellers make an informed decision whether to continue to resell WATS or order alternative facilities.

4. Furthermore, in reaffirming the transitional plan as an equitable approach to assessing access charges on WATS resellers, the Commission states that seven months is not an unreasonably long period to allow those carriers some relief from rule changes that mark a significant revision in the access charge treatment of WATS resale, particularly because those resellers subject to the transition pay all traffic-sensitive access charges during the transition period.

5. The FCC also rejects SouthernNet's request to expand the transition to include resellers of OCC WATS-like services and to permit WATS resellers to switch carriers during the transition without losing the CCLC exemption. The Commission emphasizes that the transition was aimed solely at mitigating the impact on WATS resellers of the access charge changes adopted in the First Report and Order, changes that did

not apply to resellers of WATS-like services.

6. Additionally, the Commission denies an emergency motion filed by Telephone Communications Corp., LDB Corporation, and Ad Hoc Resellers requesting a stay and/or suspension of the rule changes applicable to WATS resellers, or in the alternative, a stay of the elimination of the resellers' transition, pending court review. The Commission determines that the parties failed to meet the standards for granting a stay.

7. Finally, the Commission takes the opportunity to make one amendment to the Part 69 rules that it inadvertently failed to include in the First Report and Order. In order to fully implement the special access treatment of WATS access lines, the Commission amends § 69.155(e)(6) of its rules to make WATS access lines eligible for the self-certification exemption to the special access surcharge.

Ordering Clauses

8. Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 154 (i) and (j), 201, 202, 203, 205, 218, and 403, the petition for reconsideration filed by US West is denied.

9. It is further ordered, that the petition for reconsideration filed by SouthernNet, Inc. is denied.

10. It is further ordered, that the Motion for leave to file late comments by Litel Telecommunications Corp. is granted.

11. It is further ordered, that the Emergency Motion for Stay and or Suspension filed by Telephone Communications Corp., LDB Corporation, and Ad Hoc Resellers is denied.

12. It is further ordered, that the amendment of Part 69 of the Commission's rules set forth below is adopted, Effective April 23, 1987.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 69

Comment carrier access charges, Common carrier resale, Wide Area Telephone Service (WATS).

Part 69 of Title 47 of the Code of the Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 69—ACCESS CHARGES

1. The authority citation for Part 69 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Section 4(i), Section 4(j), 201, 202, 203, 205, 218, 403, and 410 of the Communications Act as amended; 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 201, 202, 203, 205, 218, 403, and 410.

2. Section 69.115 is amended by revising paragraph (e)(6) to read as follows:

§ 69.115 Special access surcharges.

(e) * * *

(6) Any termination of a line that the customer certifies to the exchange carrier is not connected to a PBX or other device capable of interconnecting a local exchange subscriber line with the private line or WATS access line.

William J. Tricarico,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 87-5514 Filed 3-16-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Parts 1, 73 and 74

[MM Docket No. 86-144]

Radio Broadcast Services; Experimental, Auxiliary, and Special Broadcast and Other Program Distributional Services

AGENCY: Federal Communication Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the Commission's Rules by deleting the reservation of certain commercial FM channels for Class A use. The Commission found that spectrum efficiency would be increased and the need to reserve Class A use is not longer present. Co-channel upgrades on Channel 211 will be carefully examined in TV Channel 6 markets to determine impact on noncommercial educational availability. The proposal for a blanket increase in power and antenna height for all Class A stations was found to be outside the scope of the proceeding.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 23, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joel Rosenberg, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 634-6530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's First Report and Order, MM Docket No. 86-144, adopted December 29, 1986 and released February 3, 1987. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

Summary of Report and Order

1. The Commission amended § 73.206 of its Rules by deleting the reservations of twenty commercial FM channels for

Class A use previously set forth in paragraphs (a) and (b). Paragraphs (b) and (c) of § 73.206 were removed and designated paragraphs (d) and (e), respectively, to § 73.211. The Commission amended § 74.1202 by deleting reference in paragraph (b)(1) to § 73.206(a) and by designating therein the twenty channels previously set forth in § 73.206.

2. This proceeding was initiated by the Commission to seek comments on its proposals to review and correct inconsistencies in certain FM technical rules resulting from Commission action in Docket No. 80-90. Resolution of some issues yields immediate public benefit, and such issues are easily disposed of and have substantial support from commenters. Those issues are addressed in this *First Report and Order*. The resolution of others is more appropriately left to subsequent action.

3. The Commission in Docket No. 84-231, implementing the action in Docket 80-90, added nearly 700 FM allotments to various communities. This was made possible primarily by the removal of the prohibition against operation of Class A facilities on Class B/C channels. However, the Commission did not remove the reservation of 20 channels exclusively for Channel A use. Although those 20 channels were originally reserved to insure the availability of FM service to smaller communities, the need to retain the reservations is questionable in light of the availability of the recent allotments. Although Commission policy encourages its broadcast licensees to upgrade their facilities in order to provide enhanced service to the public, retention of the reservations poses an obstacle to Class A operators wishing to upgrade on co-channels, on adjacent channels, and on IF frequencies pursuant to recently adopted amendments to the Rules. Because no other parties can use such frequencies, spectrum efficiency will be improved without detriment to the interests of other parties.

4. Upgrades on Channel 221 can adversely impact the availability of spectrum for noncommercial educational use (Channels 201-220), particularly in markets where there exists a television operation on Channel 6. In such circumstances the television operation constricts the availability of frequencies at the lower portion of the NCE band, while the upgraded operation on Channel 221 would constrict the upper portion, especially on Channels

218-220. Accordingly, petitioners seeking to upgrade on Channel 221 whose proposed 1mV/m contours would overlap the Grade B contours of Channel 6 operations will bear a particularly heavy burden in demonstrating that their proposals would serve the public interest. In particular, the Commission will examine the record in rule making proceedings to determine whether there is sufficient existing or potential noncommercial educational service.

5. The Commission has determined that no substantial benefits would result from classifying stations according to community of license rather than zone of transmitter location. The existing classification scheme has not led to significant administrative inconvenience, and it would be disruptive to remove the reference to transmitter location in § 73.206(c) of the Rules, especially where stations seek to relocate transmitters into the zones of their communities. Further, this proposal has not generated significant support. Therefore, we shall not change the rules regarding transmitter location determining the class of channel.

6. The proposals set forth in the *Notice of Proposed Rule Making* ("Notice") were limited to review and correction of inconsistencies in certain FM technical rules. Thus, comments urging a blanket increase in allowable operating power and antenna height as a more appropriate way to enhance Class A service are beyond the scope of the *Notice* and have not been considered in this proceeding.

List of Subjects

47 CFR Part 1

Practice and procedure.

47 CFR Parts 73 and 74 Radio broadcasting.

47 CFR Parts 1, 73 and 74 are amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for Parts 1, 73 and 74 continues to read:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 303.

2. Section 1.420 is amended by adding a Note following paragraph (h) to read as follows:

PART 1—[AMENDED]

§ 1.420 Additional procedures in proceedings for amendment of the FM, Television or Air-Ground Table of Assignments.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

Note: Licensees and permittees operating Class A FM stations who seek to upgrade their facilities to Class B1, B, C2, C1, or C status on Channel 221 and whose proposed 1 mV/m signal contours would overlap the Grade B contour of a television station operating on Channel 6 must meet a particularly heavy burden by demonstrating that grants of their upgrade requests are in the public interest. In this regard, the Commission will examine the record in rule making proceedings to determine the availability of existing and potential noncommercial educational service.

PART 73—[AMENDED]

§ 73.206 [Removed]

§ 73.211 [Amended]

3. Section 73.206 is removed. [Paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section are transferred to § 73.211 and designated paragraphs (d) and (e) therein.]

4. Section 73.211 is amended by adding new paragraphs (d) and (e) to read as follows:

§ 73.211 Power and antenna height requirements.

* * * * *

(d) Stations designated as Class A, B1, and B may be authorized in Zones I and I-A. Classes A, C2, C1 and C may be authorized in Zone II. The facilities for each class of station are listed in Section 73.211.

(e) The rules applicable to a particular station, including minimum and maximum facility requirements, are determined by its class. Class designation is based on the zone in which the station's transmitter is located, or proposed to be located.

PART 74—[AMENDED]

5. Section 74.1202 is amended by revising paragraph (b)(1) to read as follows:

§ 74.1202 Frequency assignment.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) Commercial FM translators: Channels 221, 224, 228, 232, 237, 240, 244, 249, 252, 257, 261, 265, 269, 272, 276, 280, 285, 288, 292, and 296.

* * * * *

Federal Communications Commission
William J. Tricarico,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 87-5689 Filed 3-16-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

Proposed Rules

Federal Register

Vol. 52, No. 51

Tuesday, March 17, 1987

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

13 CFR Part 121

Small Business Size Standards; Public Notice To Solicit Comments on Impact of Pub. L. 99-591 and 99-661

AGENCY: Small Business Administration (SBA).

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: As required by Pub. L. 99-591 and identical provisions of Pub. L. 99-661, the SBA is conducting a review of the size standards of industries in the following industry groups: construction, architecture and engineering services (including surveying and mapping), shipbuilding and ship repair, and refuse systems and related services. This notice sets forth the methodology upon which the SBA will focus the review. It also invites the public to: (1) Provide the SBA with data and perspectives which may be useful in determining whether changes to the size standards are appropriate, or in establishing the percentage of contract work which the SBA should require to be performed by the contractor's own workforce in a small business set-aside, or section 8(a) contract; and, (2) to comment upon the procedure the SBA intends to use in these efforts. This information will be utilized by the SBA when it proposes a rule change affecting its size standards and subcontracting limitations at a later date as directed by Pub. L. 99-591.

DATE: Comments to be submitted on or before April 16, 1987.

ADDRESS: Send comments to: Monika Edwards Harrison, Chairman Size Policy Board, U.S. Small Business Administration, 1441 'L' Street, NW., Room 600, Washington, DC 20416.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gene Van Arsdale, (202) 653-6373.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public Law 99-591 (an Act making continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 1987) and an identical provision of Pub. L. 99-661

(National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987) require the Small Business Administration to complete a review of the size standards applicable to certain industry categories during April 1987. The industry groups are: Construction (all SIC codes in Major Groups 15, 16, and 17 of the SIC system); Architecture and Engineering Services, including Surveying and Mapping Services (SIC codes 8711, 8712, and 8713); Shipbuilding and Ship Repair (SIC code 3731); and Refuse Systems and Related Services (SIC code 4953).

It should be noted that these groups include, in some cases, a number of industries with separate size standards. Construction, for example, includes nine industries in general construction, each with a size standard of \$17.0 million in gross annual receipts and 17 special trade industries, each with a size standard of \$7.0 million. If each of these size standards is reviewed separately, the homogeneity of size standards within the construction industries could be upset. This could result in some firms within either the general construction category, or the special trade category being considered eligible to bid on some contracts, but not on others based on size. Thus many industries could be impacted by this legislation, depending on the SBA's approach to the Act.

The review will focus on two questions. First, whether the pertinent size standards result in small business set-asides and section 8(a) contracts exceeding 30 percent of the Federal market for the industries in question. If the SBA determines that contracts awarded under the small business set-aside program and the section 8(a) program exceed 30 percent of the value of total Federal awards in any of the four industry categories, the SBA must adjust that industry size standard to a level likely to reduce small business set-asides and section 8(a) contract awards to approximately 30 percent (30 percent rule). Second, the SBA will study whether the shipbuilding and ship repair industry, and the dredging segment of the construction industry should be further divided to recognize perceived special capital equipment, labor, or geographic requirements or the emergence of a new industry.

In a separate effort, the SBA will review the composition of labor force for set-aside procurements. The law requires that any firm receiving a small

business set-aside contract for services or supplies must perform at least 50 percent of the cost of the contract (not including the cost of materials in manufacturing contracts) with its own employees. However, under the law, the SBA may change the percentage if necessary to reflect conventional industry practices among small business concerns in a specific industry category.

The SBA is also directed to establish similar subcontracting limitation requirements for general and specialty construction contracts, and other industries (such as mining) not previously cited. The public is asked to submit its views on the appropriate subcontracting limitation requirements for services, manufacturing, construction, and other industry contracts, particularly industry practices tending to show that the percentage that should be performed by a small business contractor in a specific industry should be less than 50 percent.

Methodology

Implementation of the 30 Percent Rule

The SBA will use data from the Federal Procurement Data Center for Fiscal Years 1984, 1985 and 1986 on award of contracts by Product and Service Code and by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code of the contractor. Data will also be solicited from the Department of the Navy regarding shipbuilding and ship repair and from the Army Corps of Engineers regarding dredging. The public and other Federal agencies are also requested to provide any pertinent data concerning any of the four enumerated industry categories. Industry associations are specifically encouraged to provide information and data on the impact of the law on their members in the Federal market. Many associations will be separately solicited. Finally, questionnaires will be used to obtain information from knowledgeable Federal agencies' personnel and from the private sector.

In evaluating the information submitted, greatest significance will be accorded to data from the Federal Procurement Data Center and other disinterested sources, but importance will also be attached to specialized studies by recognized authorities. All information submitted, however, will be examined and considered. The SBA will,

in compliance with the law and administrative rulemaking procedures, reduce the size standard for any of the four industry categories in which small business set-asides and 8(a) contracts have exceeded 30 percent. The new size standard will be established after consideration of the size of the Federal market, the distribution of awards by value and any established correlation between size of contractor and ability to perform contracts of varying values. In general, it is anticipated the greater that the set-aside and 8(a) percent exceeds the 30 percent threshold, the greater the size standard adjustment, although there may be some exceptions to this rule.

Industry Subdivisions

While presently the SBA's size standards are applied nationally and without geographic distinction, the SBA will consider whether to establish separate size standards for segments of industries. Segmentation of SIC codes (and correspondingly of size standards) is authorized only when (1) the Government typically designates the area where work for such contracts is to be performed, (2) Government purchases comprise the major portion of the entire domestic market for such goods or services, and (3) due to the fixed location of facilities, high mobilization costs, or similar economic factors, it is unreasonable to expect competition from business concerns located outside of the general areas where such concerns are located. Comments advocating segmentation in a particular industry should specifically address how each of these three requirements is met.

The SBA is interested in information which could establish significant differences among the markets listed below, and other industries in which capital equipment or special labor needs, or geographic requirements could argue for the segmentation of SIC codes (and, therefore, size standards). The SBA will consider any other factors established by the public or Federal agency comments.

SIC-3731 Shipbuilding and ship repair. (At present this industry has a size standard of 1,000 employees).

- (1) Nuclear ship repair and shipbuilding
- (2) Shipbuilding (nonnuclear)
- (3) Nonnuclear ship repair at:
 - (a) Puget Sound/Portland
 - (b) San Francisco
 - (c) Los Angeles/Long Beach
 - (d) San Diego
 - (e) New England
 - (f) New York/Philadelphia/New Jersey
 - (g) Norfolk/Baltimore
 - (h) Charleston

- (i) Jacksonville, Florida
- (j) Gulf Coast

SIC-1629 Heavy Construction, Not Elsewhere Classified, dredging component. (At present this industry has a size standard of \$9.5 million in gross annual receipts).

(1) Heavy Equipment/Dredging:

- (a) Northeast
- (b) Southeast
- (c) Gulf Coast
- (d) West Coast
- (e) Great Lakes

(2) Heavy Equipment/Dredging:

- (a) Northeast
- (b) Southeast
- (c) Gulf Coast
- (d) West Coast
- (e) Great Lakes

Implementation of Subcontracting Limitations

In determining the degree of subcontracting to be allowed within small business set-asides and 8(a) contracts, (the assurance as to composition of labor force requirement of the law) the SBA intends to use the statutory figure of 50 percent as its reference point for all service and supply (including manufacturing) industries, and the figures established in the SBA's regulation (13 CFR Part 124) for 8(a) firms as the reference point for construction. This regulation stipulates that "at least 15 percent of the contract labor value for general contractors and 25 percent of special trades, must be performed with the contractor's own work force."

The SBA will seek data from contracting agencies and from associations and individuals in the private sector which will indicate the validity of these reference points for the four industry groups subject to the statutory size standards review. The SBA also requests comments concerning whether these subcontracting limitations are appropriate for all industry categories. Industry studies and surveys will be considered along with the recommendations of Federal procuring agencies and personnel. Data on an industry-wide basis, developed by disinterested groups or recognized authorities, will be given greater consideration than more narrow studies or materials from advocates of specific rules.

The projected time for implementation of the law is:

Proposed Rule: Spring 1987

Final Rule: Summer 1987

Effective Date of Final Rule: October 1, 1987

Public Comment

Public comments on the above issues will be used to prepare a statutorily required report to the Congress on the SBA's findings and determinations from this size standard review. The public is therefore requested to provide comments or data bearing on the above issues, specifically:

(a) Adjustment of size standards in the four named industry categories to a level that will likely reduce the total combined 8(a) and set-aside contracts awarded to approximately 30 percent of the value of Federal contracts in those four industry categories.

(b) The validity of market segmentations, addressing the specific requirements which must be met before segmentation can occur.

(c) The validity of the labor force or subcontracting limitations.

In addition to these broad issues which are cited by the law, the SBA invites comment on the following more restricted issues:

(1) What methodology should the SBA use to determine the level to set a size standard to accommodate the 30 percent rule?

(2) What should the SBA do when the data implementing the 30 percent decision rule are considered unreliable?

(3) Assuming that size standards based on geographic or regional variations are warranted in several industry categories, who should define the regional lines? Should different industries have different regional lines?

(4) If the SBA were to set size standards based on capital equipment differences, who should decide the capital equipment guidelines separating the various kinds of equipment in question?

(5) Would several different size standards for the same industry, based on variations in capital equipment and geography, be confusing or administratively inconvenient to use?

(6) Are the labor force or subcontracting restrictions reasonable? To what degree should industries vary in their contracting limitations?

The public may wish to comment on these questions from a generalized viewpoint in which the SBA's entire program is evaluated, or from the more specialized viewpoint focusing on that industry which might be of particular interest to be commenter. Each commenter is requested to cite the factual basis upon which his or her opinion is predicated. The various comments will be incorporated in a report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committees on Small

Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

While the SBA must work within the requirements of the law, it is nonetheless interested in the public comments on the possible impact and method of implementing any size standard changes. The SBA will follow the "Administrative Procedures Act," including publication of a proposed rule and request for additional comments, before making any final changes in the size regulations (13 CFR 121). Also the SBA is sending written requests for comments on this notice to various trade organizations and procuring agencies of the Government as well as requesting publication of a special notice in the Commerce Department's "Commerce Business Daily."

Commenters are requested to state their views on what specific size standard adjustments, market segmentations, and subcontracting restrictions need to be made with respect to the construction, architectural and engineering, shipbuilding and ship repair, and refuse systems industries in order to meet the intent of the statute.

Dated: March 3, 1987.

Charles L. Heatherly,

Deputy Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration.

[FR Doc. 87-5648 Filed 3-16-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 87-NM-20-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This notice proposes a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Model 757 series airplanes, which would require certain modifications to improve the Instrument Landing System (ILS) immunity to electromagnetic interference (EMI). This proposal is prompted by reports of several airplane models in which EMI generated by various digital electronic equipment has been shown to be a source of false localizer signals which can cause apparently normal operation of the localizer deviation bars when no ILS signal is present. This condition, if not corrected, could lead to erroneous ILS deviation information displayed to

the flight crew and abnormal operation of the autopilot.

DATE: Comments must be received no later than May 4, 1987.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in duplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration, Northwest Mountain Region, Office of the Regional Counsel (Attn: ANM-103), Attention: Airworthiness Rules Docket No. 87-NM-20-AD, 17900 Pacific Highway South, C-68966, Seattle, Washington 98168. The applicable service information may be obtained from the Boeing Commercial Airplane Company, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124. This information may be examined at the FAA, Northwest Mountain Region, 17900 Pacific Highway South, Seattle, Washington, or the Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 9010 East Marginal Way South, Seattle, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Kenneth J. Schroer, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM-130S; telephone (206) 431-1943. Mailing address: FAA, Northwest Mountain Region, 17900 Pacific Highway South, C-68966, Seattle, Washington 98168.

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 should identify the regulatory docket number and be submitted in duplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments specified above will be considered by the Administrator before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this Notice may be changed in light of the comments received. 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.

Availability of NPRM

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the FAA, Northwest Mountain Region, Office of the Regional Counsel (Attn: ANM-103), Attention: Airworthiness Rules Docket No. 87-NM-20-AD, 17900 Pacific Highway South, C-68966, Seattle, Washington 98168. Discussion: An operator of a Boeing Model 737 airplane

reported a condition where selection of certain ILS frequencies, with no operating ILS ground transmitter, resulted in localizer deviation indication and retraction of warning flags on the radio digital distance magnetic indicator indicating a valid response. Further investigation found this condition to exist on several other airplane models which have the localizer antenna located on the nose bulkhead. The degree of interference varies from one airplane model to another. The problem detected on certain Model 757 airplanes results from emissions of radio frequency interference within the VHF frequency band from the digital weather radar receiver-transmitter units and the electronic flight instrumentation system (EFIS) symbol generator. These emissions are greater than the minimum sensitivity of the ILS receiver and have a frequency composition which leads the receivers to interpret them as valid signals.

If an ILS frequency should be selected which corresponds to one of these radiated emissions, and the ground transmitter is out of range or out of service, erroneous ILS deviation could be displayed to the flight crew and abnormal operation of the autopilot system may occur.

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Service Bulletin 757-34A0042, dated February 3, 1987, which describes the appropriate airplane wire bundle modification to reduce susceptibility to this interference problem.

Since this condition is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of this same type design, an AD is proposed which would require modification to the weather radar wire bundles and coaxial cables from the localizer and glideslope antennas in accordance with the service bulletin previously mentioned.

It is estimated that 64 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this AD, that it would take approximately 78 manhours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor cost would be \$40 per manhour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$199,680.

For these reasons, the FAA has determined that this document (1) involves a proposed regulation which is not major under Executive Order 12291 and (2) is not a significant rule pursuant to the Department of Transportation Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and it is further certified under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act that this proposed rule, if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a