

Regulatory Review Plan Under Executive Order 13579

FHFA's current review of OFHEO, FHFB, and certain HUD regulations is similar to the review it will conduct of existing regulations under Executive Order 13579. The regulatory review plan is set forth below. FHFA will conduct the review of its existing regulations under Executive Order 13579 at least every five years. In light of the recent establishment of FHFA and ongoing regulatory activities mandated by HERA and the Dodd-Frank Act, the first review will begin no later than August 2013, five years after the establishment of FHFA. FHFA regulations published in Chapter XII of Title 12 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* and are also posted on the FHFA Internet Web site at <http://www.fhfa.gov>.

After considering all comments received, FHFA will publish a notice of the final regulatory review plan in the **Federal Register** and post it on the FHFA Web site, <http://www.fhfa.gov>.

The interim regulatory review plan follows.

Plan for Review of Existing Regulations Under Executive Order 13579

a. *Scope and timing of regulatory reviews.* At least every five years, FHFA will conduct a review of the regulations it has issued and that are in effect. The first regulatory review will begin no later than August 2013.

b. *Factors considered in the regulatory reviews.* The regulatory reviews will take into consideration the following factors, as applicable:

(1) Legal or regulatory developments, including new laws, executive orders or judicial decisions that have been adopted since the promulgation of a regulation that make such regulation inefficient, obsolete, contrary to controlling legal precedent, or unduly burdensome;

(2) Application by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, or a Federal Home Loan Bank (regulated entity) or the Office of Finance of the Federal Home Loan Bank System for revision of a regulation because of reasonably discernible regulatory burden or inefficiency;

(3) Marketplace developments, technological evolution and related changes that may have rendered an existing regulation, in whole or in part, inefficient, outmoded, or outdated;

(4) Such other occurrences or developments as determined by FHFA to be relevant to a review for inefficiency or unwarranted regulatory burden;

(5) Whether the provisions of the regulation are written in plain language or otherwise need clarification;

(6) Compelling evidence that a consolidation of two or more regulations, elimination of a duplicative regulation, or other revision to regulatory requirements would facilitate compliance by or supervision of a regulated entity or the Office of Finance;

(7) A demonstration of a better alternative method to effect a regulatory purpose or requirement supported by compelling evidence of significantly less intrusive means or of a substantially more efficient method of accomplishing the same supervisory purpose; and

(8) Such other factors as determined by FHFA to be relevant to determining and evaluating the need for and effectiveness of a particular regulation.

c. *Regulatory review process.*—(1) The regulatory reviews will be conducted by the FHFA Office of General Counsel, under the direction of the General Counsel, and will include internal consultation with other FHFA offices and staff, guidance provided by the FHFA Director, as well as consideration of public comments.

(2) A review and report of findings and recommendations will be provided to the FHFA Director on a timely basis. The report of findings and recommendations will be privileged and confidential.

(3) After receiving the report of findings and recommendations, the FHFA Director will determine what steps may be necessary to relieve any unnecessary burden, including amendment to or repeal of existing regulations or issuance of less formal guidance.

d. *No right of action.* The regulatory reviews are not formal or informal rulemaking proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act and create no right of action against FHFA. Moreover, the determination of FHFA to conduct or not to conduct a review of a regulation and any determination, finding, or recommendation resulting from any review are not final agency actions and, as such, are not subject to judicial review.

Dated: September 16, 2011.

Edward J. DeMarco,

Acting Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency.

[FR Doc. 2011-24405 Filed 9-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8070-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2011-0992; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-126-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A, CL-601-3R, and CL-604 Variants) Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This proposed 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:

Three (3) events have occurred where the Air-Driven Generator (ADG) failed to provide power on CL-600-2B19 (CRJ) aeroplanes during their regularly scheduled operational/functional checks. An investigation revealed that in all cases, the silver-plated copper wires within the ADG power feeder cables were damaged due to galvanic corrosion. It was subsequently determined that the silver-plating is inadequate for this application.

In the event of damage to the power feeder cable wires, the ADG may not be able to provide emergency electrical power to the aeroplane.

Although there have been no reported failures to date on any CL-600-2B16 (604 Variant) aeroplanes, a sampling program carried out on these aeroplanes showed signs of microscopic galvanic corrosion on the ADG power feeder cable wires.

* * * * *

The proposed AD would require actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by November 7, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* (202) 493-2251.
- *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor,

Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact Bombardier, Inc., 400 Côte-Vertu Road West, Dorval, Québec H4S 1Y9, Canada; telephone 514-855-5000; fax 514-855-7401; e-mail thd.crj@aero.bombardier.com; Internet <http://www.bombardier.com>. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425-227-1221.

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 this proposed AD, 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Assata Dessaline, Aerospace Engineer, Avionics and Flight Test Branch, ANE-172, FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, New York 11590; telephone (516) 228-7301; fax (516) 794-5531.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include "Docket No. FAA-2011-0992; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-126-AD" at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD based on those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

Discussion

The Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA), which is the aviation authority for Canada, has issued Canadian Airworthiness Directive CF-2011-08, dated April 28, 2011 (referred to after this as "the MCAI"), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

Three (3) events have occurred where the Air-Driven Generator (ADG) failed to provide power on CL-600-2B19 (CRJ) aeroplanes during their regularly scheduled operational/functional checks. An investigation revealed that in all cases, the silver-plated copper wires within the ADG power feeder cables were damaged due to galvanic corrosion. It was subsequently determined that the silver-plating is inadequate for this application.

In the event of damage to the power feeder cable wires, the ADG may not be able to provide emergency electrical power to the aeroplane.

Although there have been no reported failures to date on any CL-600-2B16 (604 Variant) aeroplanes, a sampling program carried out on these aeroplanes showed signs of microscopic galvanic corrosion on the ADG power feeder cable wires.

This directive is issued to correct this potentially unsafe condition by mandating the replacement of all ADG power feeder cables * * * with an ADG power feeder cable that contains tin-plated copper wires.

You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Relevant Service Information

Bombardier has issued Service Bulletin 604-24-024, dated January 31, 2011. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This Proposed AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with the State of Design Authority, we have been notified of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are proposing this AD because we evaluated all pertinent information and determined an unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design.

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 proposed different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow FAA policies. Any such differences are highlighted in a NOTE within the proposed AD.

Costs of Compliance

Based on the service information, we estimate that this proposed AD would affect about 72 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 24 work-hours per product to comply with the basic requirements of this proposed AD. The average labor rate is \$85 per work-hour. Required parts would cost about \$1,897 per product. Where the service information lists required parts costs that are covered under warranty, we have assumed that there will be no charge for these parts. As we do not control warranty coverage for affected parties, some parties may incur costs higher than estimated here. Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators to be \$283,464, or \$3,937 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 proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD would 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 proposed regulation:

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 proposed AD and placed it in the AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

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

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

Bombardier, Inc.: Docket No. FAA–2011–0992; Directorate Identifier 2011–NM–126–AD.

Comments Due Date

- (a) We must receive comments by November 7, 2011.

Affected ADs

- (b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Bombardier, Inc. Model CL–600–2B16 (CL–601–3A, CL–601–3R, & CL–604 Variants) airplanes, certificated in any category, serial numbers 5301, 5302, 5305 through 5318 inclusive, 5320 through 5328 inclusive, 5331 through 5349 inclusive, 5351 through 5367 inclusive, 5369 through 5408 inclusive, 5410, 5412 through 5426 inclusive, 5428 through 5438 inclusive, 5440 through 5489 inclusive, 5491 through 5498 inclusive, 5500 through 5517 inclusive, 5519 through 5522 inclusive, and 5524 through 5665 inclusive.

Subject

- (d) Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 24: Electrical power.

Reason

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

Three (3) events have occurred where the Air-Driven Generator (ADG) failed to provide power on CL–600–2B19 (CRJ) aeroplanes during their regularly scheduled operational/functional checks. An investigation revealed that in all cases, the silver-plated copper wires within the ADG power feeder cables were damaged due to galvanic corrosion. It was subsequently determined that the silver-plating is inadequate for this application.

In the event of damage to the power feeder cable wires, the ADG may not be able to provide emergency electrical power to the aeroplane.

Although there have been no reported failures to date on any CL–600–2B16 (604 Variant) aeroplanes, a sampling program carried out on these aeroplanes showed signs of microscopic galvanic corrosion on the ADG power feeder cable wires.

* * * * *

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 72 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the ADG power feeder cable, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Bombardier Service Bulletin 604–24–024, dated January 31, 2011.

FAA AD Differences

Note 1: 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, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), ANE–170, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the ACO, send it to ATTN: Program Manager, Continuing Operational Safety, FAA, New York ACO, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, New York 11590; telephone 516–228–7300; fax 516–794–5531. Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/certificate holding 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.

Related Information

- (i) Refer to MCAI Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA) Airworthiness Directive CF–2011–08, dated April 28, 2011; and Bombardier Service Bulletin 604–24–024, dated January 31, 2011; for related information.

Issued in Renton, Washington on September 16, 2011.

Ali Bahrami,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–24432 Filed 9–22–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

24 CFR Part 985

[Docket No. FR–5532–P–01]

RIN 2577–AC76

Revision to the Section 8 Management Assessment Program Lease-Up Indicator

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would amend HUD's regulations for the Section 8 Management Assessment program (SEMAP) to revise the process by which HUD measures and verifies performance under the SEMAP lease-up indicator. Specifically, HUD proposes to amend the existing regulation to reflect that assessment of a public housing agency's (PHA) leasing indicator will be based on a calendar year cycle, rather than a fiscal year cycle, which would increase administrative efficiencies for PHAs. This proposed rule would also clarify that units assisted under the voucher homeownership option or occupied under a project-based housing assistance (HAP) contract are included in the assessment of PHA units leased.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* October 24, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposed rule to the Regulations Division, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 10276, Washington, DC 20410–0500. Communications should refer to the above docket number and title. There are two methods for submitting public comments. All submissions must refer to the above docket number and title.

1. *Submission of Comments by Mail.* Comments may be submitted by mail to