text and adding paragraphs (c)(2)(i) and (c)(2)(ii) introductory text prior to the table to read as follows:

§ 701.34 Designation of low income status; Acceptance of secondary capital accounts by low-income designated credit unions.

(b) * * *

(7) Availability to cover losses. Funds deposited into a secondary capital account, including interest accrued and paid into the secondary capital account, must be available to cover operating losses realized by the LICU that exceed its net available reserves (exclusive of secondary capital and allowance accounts for loan and lease losses), and to the extent funds are so used, the LICU must not restore or replenish the account under any circumstances. The LICU may, in lieu of paying interest into the secondary capital account, pay accrued interest directly to the investor or into a separate account from which the secondary capital investor may make withdrawals. Losses must be distributed pro-rata among all secondary capital accounts held by the LICU at the time the losses are realized. In instances where a LICU accepted secondary capital from the United States Government or any of its subdivisions under the Community Development Capital Initiative of 2010 (“CDCI secondary capital”) and matching funds were required under the Initiative and are on deposit in the form of secondary capital at the time a loss is realized, a LICU must apply either of the following pro-rata loss distribution procedures to its secondary capital accounts with respect to the loss:

(i) If not inconsistent with any agreements governing other secondary capital on deposit at the time a loss is realized, the CDCI secondary capital may be excluded from the calculation of the pro-rata loss distribution until all of its matching secondary capital has been depleted, thereby causing the CDCI secondary capital to be held as senior to all other secondary capital until its matching secondary capital is exhausted. The CDCI secondary capital should be included in the calculation of the pro-rata loss distribution and is available to cover the loss only after all of its matching secondary capital has been depleted.

(ii) Regardless of any agreements applicable to other secondary capital, the CDCI secondary capital and its matching secondary capital may be considered a single account for purposes of determining a pro-rata share of the loss and the amount determined as the pro-rata share for the combined account must first be applied to the matching secondary capital account, thereby causing the CDCI secondary capital to be held as senior to its matching secondary capital. The CDCI secondary capital is available to cover the loss only after all of its matching secondary capital has been depleted.

(c) * * *

(2) Schedule for recognizing net worth value. The LICU’s reflection of the net worth value of the accounts in its financial statement may never exceed the full balance of the secondary capital on deposit after any early redemptions and losses. For accounts with remaining maturities of less than five years, the LICU must reflect the net worth value of the accounts in its financial statement in accordance with the lesser of:

(i) The remaining balance of the accounts after any redemptions and losses; or

(ii) The amounts calculated based on the following schedule:

* * *

[FR Doc. 2010–23652 Filed 9–22–10; 8:45 am]
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RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Model Galaxy and Gulfstream 200 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

Extension of airbrakes above 360 KIAS [knots indicated air speed]/0.79 M, [Mach indicated] results in aerodynamic driven vibration of the airbrake, which, if not limited per Revision 14 to the AFM [airplane flight manual], can lead to high cycle fatigue failure of the airbrake in-board hinge.

The unsafe condition is high cycle fatigue of the airbrake in-board hinge, which can result in loss of the airbrake, which in turn can lead to reduced controllability of the airplane. We are issuing this AD to require actions to correct the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD becomes effective October 28, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov or in person at the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 to include an AD that would apply to the specified products. That NPRM was published in the Federal Register on June 25, 2010 (75 FR 36296). That NPRM proposed to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

Extension of airbrakes above 360 KIAS [knots indicated air speed]/0.79 M, [Mach indicated] results in aerodynamic driven vibration of the airbrake which, if not limited per Revision 14 to the AFM [airplane flight manual], can lead to high cycle fatigue failure of the airbrake in-board hinge.

The unsafe condition is high cycle fatigue of the airbrake in-board hinge, which can result in loss of the airbrake, which in turn can lead to reduced controllability of the airplane. The required action includes revising the Limitations section of the Gulfstream 200 Airplane Flight Manual to prohibit deploying the air brakes above the stated speed. You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Comments

We gave the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. We received no comments on the NPRM or on the determination of the cost to the public.

Conclusion

We reviewed the available data and determined that air safety and the
public interest require adopting the AD as proposed.

Differences Between This AD and the MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and related service information and, in general, agree with their substance. But we might have found it necessary to use different words from those in the MCAI to ensure the AD is clear for U.S. operators and is enforceable. In making these changes, we do not intend to differ substantively from the information provided in the MCAI and related service information.

We might also have required different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow our FAA policies. Any such differences are highlighted in a NOTE within the AD.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this AD will affect about 90 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it will take about 1 work-hour per product to comply with the basic requirements of this AD. The average labor rate is $85 per work-hour. Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of this AD to the U.S. operators to be $7,650, or $85 per product.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA’s authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. “Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs,” describes in more detail the scope of the Agency’s authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in “Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.” Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify this AD:

1. Is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866;
2. Is not a “significant rule” under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and
3. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this AD and placed it in the AD docket.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov; or in person at the Docket Operations office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains the NPRM, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone (800) 647–5527) is in the ADDRESSES section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

Note 1:

Air Transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new AD:

2010–20–04 Gulfstream Aerospace LP
(Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.):

Effective Date

(a) This airworthiness directive (AD) becomes effective October 28, 2010.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate previously held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Model Galaxy and Gulfstream 200 airplanes, all serial numbers, certificated in any category.

Subject

(d) Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 27: Flight controls.

Reason

(e) The mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) states:

Extension of airbrakes above 360 KIAS [knots indicated air speed]/0.79 M [Mach indicated] results in aerodynamic driven vibration of the airbrake which, if not limited per Revision 14 to the AFM (airplane flight manual), can lead to high cycle fatigue failure of the airbrake in-board hinge.

The unsafe condition is high cycle fatigue of the airbrake in-board hinge, which can result in loss of the airbrake, which in turn can lead to reduced controllability of the airplane.

Compliance

(f) You are responsible for having the actions required by this AD performed within the compliance times specified, unless the actions have already been done.

Actions

(g) Within 60 days after the effective date of this AD: Revise the Limitations section of the Gulfstream 200 AFM to include the following statement. This may be done by inserting a copy of this AD into the AFM.

“MAXIMUM AIR BRAKES OPERATION/EXTENDED SPEED

360 KIAS/0.79 M.

NOTE

During emergency, air brakes may be used at speeds above 0.79 M.”

Note 1:

When a statement identical to that in paragraph (g) of this AD has been included in the general revisions of the AFM, the general revisions may be inserted into the AFM, and the copy of this AD may be removed from the AFM.

Note 2:

The Gulfstream 200 AFM applies to both the Model Galaxy and Gulfstream 200 airplanes.

FAA AD Differences

Note 3:

This AD differs from the MCAI and/or service information as follows: No differences.

Other FAA AD Provisions

(h) The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCS): The Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCS for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. Send information to ATTN: Mike Borfitz, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98057–3356; telephone (425) 227–2607; fax (425) 227–1149. Before using any approved AMOC on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify your principal maintenance inspector (PMI) or principal avionics inspector (PAI), as appropriate, or lacking a principal inspector, your local Flight Standards District Office.
The AMOC approval letter must specifically reference this AD.

(2) Airworthy Product: For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(3) Reporting Requirements: For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

Related Information

Material Incorporated by Reference
(j) None.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on September 10, 2010.

Jeffrey E. Duven,
Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–23741 Filed 9–22–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39
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Airworthiness Directives; Robert E. Rust, Jr. Model DeHavilland DH.C1 Chipmunk 21, DH.C1 Chipmunk 22, and DH.C1 Chipmunk 22A Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The FAA is correcting an airworthiness directive (AD) that published in the Federal Register. That AD applies to the products listed above. The AD number in the 14 CFR Part 39 section and the § 39.13 [Amended] section is incorrect. This document corrects that error. In all other respects, the original document remains the same.

DATES: This AD remains effective October 7, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The address for the Docket Office (phone: 800–647–5527) is Document Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carey O’Kelley, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, Georgia 30337; telephone: (404) 474–5543; fax: (404) 474–5606; e-mail: carey.o. kelley@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Airworthiness Directive 2010–18–12, amendment 39–16426 (75 FR 53861, September 2, 2010), currently requires you to do a one-time inspection of the flap operating system for an unapproved latch plate design installation, with replacement as necessary for Robert E. Rust, Jr. Model DeHavilland DH.C1 Chipmunk 21, DH.C1 Chipmunk 22, and DH.C1 Chipmunk 22A airplanes.

As published, the AD number in the 14 CFR Part 39 section and § 39.13 [Amended] section is incorrect.

No other part of the preamble or regulatory information has been changed; therefore, only the changed portion of the final rule is being published in the Federal Register.

The effective date of this AD remains October 7, 2010.

Correction of Non-Regulatory Text

In the Federal Register of September 2, 2010, AD 2010–18–12; Amendment 39–16426 is corrected as follows:

On page 53861, in the 3rd column, on line 6 under 14 CFR Part 39, change “AD 2010–18–01” to “AD 2010–18–12.”

On page 53863, in the 1st column, on line 4 under § 39.13 [Amended], change “AD 2010–18–01” to “AD 2010–18–12.”

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on August 16, 2010.

William J. Timberlake,
Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–23745 Filed 9–22–10; 8:45 am]
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Amendment of Class E Airspace; Brewton, AL

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule, technical amendment.

SUMMARY: This action amends Class E airspace at Brewton Municipal Airport, Brewton, AL, by updating the geographic coordinates of the airport to aid in the navigation of our National Airspace System.

DATES: Effective date: 0901 UTC. October 25, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melinda Giddens, Operations Support Group, Eastern Service Center, Federal Aviation Administration, P.O. Box 20636, Atlanta, Georgia 30320; telephone (404) 305–5610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

The FAA received a request from the National Aeronautical Navigation Services (NANS) to update the geographic coordinates of Brewton Municipal Airport, Brewton, AL. This action makes the adjustment. Accordingly, since this is an administrative change, and does not involve a change in the dimensions or operating requirements of that airspace, notice and public procedures under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) are unnecessary.

The Class E airspace designations are published in Paragraph 6005 of FAA order 7400.9U, dated August 18, 2010, and effective September 15, 2010, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

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, is non-controversial and unlikely to result in adverse or negative comments. 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