The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange[4] and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6 of the Act[5] and the rules and regulations thereunder. The Commission finds specifically that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[6] because it is designed to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act[7], that the proposed rule change (File No. SR–Phlx–2001–54) be, and it hereby is, approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[8]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–20857 Filed 8–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[4] In approving this proposed rule change, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78f.

[6] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[7] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[8] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster #3354]

Commonwealth of Virginia; Amendment #2

In accordance with a notice received from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, dated August 9, 2001, the above numbered declaration is hereby amended to include Lee County as a disaster area due to damages caused by Severe Storms and Flooding occurring on July 8, 2001 and continuing.

In addition, applications for economic injury loans from small businesses located in the following contiguous counties may be filed until the specified date at the previously designated location: Bell County in Kentucky; and Claiborne County in Tennessee. All other contiguous counties have been previously declared.

All other information remains the same, *i.e.*, the deadline for filing applications for physical damage is September 10, 2001, and for loans for economic injury the deadline is April 12, 2002.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008.)

Dated: August 14, 2001.

Herbert L. Mitchell,

Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–20868 Filed 8–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster #3339]

State of Wisconsin; Amendment #7]

In accordance with a notice received from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, dated July 6, 2001, the above-numbered Declaration is hereby amended to establish the incident period for this disaster as occurring between April 10, 2001 and continuing through July 6, 2001. All other information remains the same, i.e., the deadline for filing applications for physical damage is August 10, 2001 and for economic injury the deadline is February 11, 2002.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008)

Dated: August 14, 2001.

Herbert L. Mitchell,

Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–20867 Filed 8–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Tennessee Valley Authority (Meeting No. 1533).

TIME AND DATE: 9 a.m. (CDT), August 22, 2001.

PLACE: Cedar Ridge Middle School Auditorium, 2715 Danville Road, SW., Decatur, Alabama.

STATUS: Open.

Agenda

Approval of minutes of meeting held on July 18, 2001.

New Business

B—Purchase Awards

B1. Contract with Allied Welding & Safety, LLC, for welding supplies and equipment.

B2. Supplement to contract with Shook and Fletcher Insulation Company to increase the total contract spending ceiling to $19.5 million for insulation materials and related products and authorize an additional two years to the contract term.

C—Energy

C1. Supplement to Contract No. 99999906 with Holtec International, Inc., for an independent spent fuel storage installation and dry cask storage system for Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant and delegation of authority to the Senior Vice President, Procurement, or a designee, to further supplement the contract by adding construction and other activities to the scope of the work.

E—Real Property Transaction

E1. Grant of 30-year easement for a natural gas pipeline to BAMAGAS Company and modification of existing term easements affecting Tract Nos. XPR–463P, XPR–178P, XPR–179P, XPR–180P, XPR–181P, XPR–334P, XPR–335P, XPR–336P, XPR–337P, XPR–442P, XPR–443P, XPR–444P, XWR–338P, XWR–389P, XWR–390P, XWR–392P, XWR–395P, XWR–510P, XWR–570P located on Pickwick and Wheeler Reservoirs in Colbert, Lawrence, Morgan, and Limestone Counties, Alabama.

F—Other

F1. Approval to file a condemnation case to acquire a transmission line easement and right-of-way, affecting Tract No. MRFS–116, the Murfreesboro-Smyrna No. 2 line in Rutherford County, Tennessee.

Information Items

1. Concurrence by the individual members of the Board of Directors for the issuance of TVA Power Bonds and the execution of a currency swap agreement with Morgan Stanley Capital Services, Inc.

2. Approval for sale and leaseback or lease and leaseback of eight combustion turbines being purchased for the Lagoon Creek Combustion Turbine Plant.

3. Approval of Wilshire Associates Incorporated as a new investment manager for the TVA Retirement System and approval of the Investment Management Agreement between the Retirement System and this new investment manager.

For more information: Please call TVA Media Relations at (865) 632–6000, Knoxville, Tennessee. Information is also available at TVA's Washington Office (202) 898–2999. People who plan to attend the meeting and have special needs should call (865) 632–6000.

Dated: August 15, 2001.

Maureen H. Dunn,

General Counsel and Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–20997 Filed 8–16–01; 11:35 am]

BILLING CODE 8120–02–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Proposed Revisions to Advisory Circular 25–7A, Flight Test Guide for Certification of Transport Category Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed advisory circular and request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice requests comments regarding proposed revisions to Advisory Circular (AC) 25–7A, ''Flight Test Guide for Certification of Transport Category Airplanes.'' AC 25–7A provides guidance on acceptance means, but not the only means, of demonstrating compliance with the airworthiness standards for transport category airplanes. The proposed revisions harmonize, expand, and clarify existing advisory material concerning certain airplane performance requirements to address inconsistencies in the means of compliance with the existing airworthiness standard and to reflect increased knowledge of airplane and propulsion system performance modeling and test verification practices since the standard was established. This notice provides interested persons an opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to AC 25–7A.

DATES: Your comments must be received on or before October 19, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You should send your comments on the proposed AC revisions to the Federal Aviation Administration, Attention: Don Stimson, Airplane & Flight Crew Interface Branch, ANM–111, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 1601 Lind Ave SW., Renton, WA 98055–4056. You may examine comments at this address between 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. weekdays, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Stimson, Airplane & Flight Crew Interface Branch, ANM–111, at the above address, telephone 425–227–1129, or facsimile 425–227–1320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Your are invited to comment on the proposed revisions to AC 25–7A by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as you may desire. You should identify the title of the AC and submit your comments in duplicate to the address specified above. The Transport Airplane Directorate will consider comments received on or before the closing date for comments before issuing the revision to AC 25–7A. You may view the complete text of AC 25–7A at the following Internet address: *http://www.faa.gov/avr/air/airhome.htm* at the link titled ''Advisory Circulars'' under the ''Available Information'' drop-down menu.

Discussion

Harmonization of Standards and Guidance

The following proposed revisions to AC 25–7A are based on a recommendation that the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) submitted to the FAA. The FAA tasked ARAC (63 FR 50954, September 23, 1998) to provide advice and recommendations on ''harmonizing'' certain sections of part 25 (including 25.101(c)) with the counterpart standards contained in Joint Aviation Requirements (JAR) 25. The goal of ''harmonization tasks'' such as this is to ensure that:

- Where possible, standards and guidance do not require domestic and foreign parties to manufacture or operate to different standards for each county involved; and
- The standards and guidance adopted are mutually acceptable to the FAA and the foreign aviation authorities.

What Are the Differences in the FAA and JAA Standards or Policy and What Do These differences Result In?

In the case of § 25.101(c), the FAA and JAA standards are the same. The differences are in the policies and certification approval practices relative to altitude/temperature extrapolation of takeoff performance data.

In general, both FAA and JAA policy is to limit the unrestricted extrapolation of takeoff data to 6,000 feet above the altitude at which the takeoff performance data are obtained. For further extrapolations, a takeoff distance penalty of 2 percent must be applied for each 1,000 feet of extrapolation beyond the 6,000-foot limit. For the FAA, a further constraint is that engine data may only be extrapolated 3,000 feet above the altitude at which specific engine data have been obtained to verify takeoff thrust models.

For the JAA, a 2 percent takeoff distance penalty must also be applied for every 5°C of temperature extrapolation beyond a temperature that exceeds either:

- A temperature 15°C higher than the maximum temperature tested; or
- The amount by which the maximum temperature tested exceeds the minimum temperature tested.

The FAA does not apply extrapolation limits for temperature. Instead, the FAA policy is to require engine limits compliance to be demonstrated by airplane testing at a sea level ambient temperature near the highest temperature for which the engine is flat-rated. In addition, to allow higher altitude data extrapolation, the use of engine power setting overboost will generally provide higher temperature conditions (*i.e.,* closer to the flat-rated highest temperature) at the simulated altitude.

Since these policies represent only one means of compliance with the regulatory standards, the criteria noted above have not always been strictly applied. For example, experience from previous certification programs, combined with thorough substantiation of an acceptable model of engine thrust and lapse rate characteristics, has been used to allow extrapolations beyond 6,000 feet above the highest altitude tested without applying a conservative factor. In the same vein, the 3,000-foot extrapolation limit on engine data has not always been applied.

Considerably more experience has since been gained both in terms of modeling airplane and propulsion system (turbine engines and propellers, where appropriate) performance and in verifying the accuracy of these models for determining high (and low) altitude takeoff and landing performance. This experience has shown that the soundness of the extrapolation is primarily a function of the accuracy of the propulsion system performance model and its integration with the airplane drag model. The basic aerodynamic characteristics of the airplane do not change significantly with altitude or ambient temperature, and any such effects are readily taken into account by standard airplane performance modeling practices.

The effect of the proposed changes to the acceptable means of compliance that is proposed to replace the current guidance material in AC 25–7A would be to allow extrapolation of airplane takeoff and landing performance data to higher and lower altitudes without applying an arbitrary distance penalty if the following criteria are met:

- A comprehensive propulsion system model is developed covering the entire operational envelope and