

law if the Administrator determines that application of the requirement, or provision, or failure to take action in the case of an omission would adversely affect the Government's financial interest. The Administrator will exercise this authority upon request of the State Director with the recommendation of the Assistant Administrator for Housing. Requests for exception must be made in writing accompanied by the borrower's casefile in cases involving specific borrowers and supported with documentation to explain the adverse effect, propose alternative courses of action, and to show how the adverse effect will be eliminated or minimized if the exception is granted.

§ 1980.398 Unauthorized assistance and other deficiencies.

(a) *Unauthorized assistance.*

Unauthorized assistance includes, but is not limited to, issuance of a loan note guarantee when the borrower was not eligible for the loan or the borrower was eligible but the loan was not made for authorized purposes. Unauthorized assistance in the form of interest assistance is discussed in § 1980.390.

(b) *Initial determination of unauthorized assistance.* The reasons for unauthorized assistance being received by the Lender may include:

- (1) Submission of false or inaccurate information by the Lender;
- (2) Submission of false or inaccurate information by the borrower;
- (3) Error by RHCDS personnel; or
- (4) Error by the Lender.

(c) [Reserved]

(d) [Reserved]

(e) *Categories of unauthorized assistance.*

(1) *Minor deficiency.* A minor deficiency is one that does not change the eligibility of the borrower, the eligibility of the property, or amount of the loan. Such incidents will be brought to the Lender's attention in writing. Examples of minor deficiencies include improperly completed builder certifications, use of an outdated credit report, or use of an outdated income verification. Minor deficiencies also include those significant deficiencies when the Lender is willing and able to correct the problem such as obtaining flood insurance for a dwelling located in a flood hazard area and assuring the escrow amount is sufficient.

(2) *Significant deficiency.* A significant deficiency is one that creates a significant risk of loss to the Government, or involves acceptance of a borrower or property not permitted by Agency regulations. Such cases may result in probation or withdrawal of the Lender's approval for program

participation. Examples of significant deficiencies include gross miscalculation of income, acceptance of property that is severely deficient of the required standards, missing builder certifications, and construction changes that materially affect value without proper change orders.

(3) *Fraud or misrepresentation.* A deficiency that involves an action by the Lender to misrepresent either the financial capacity of the borrower or the condition of the property being financed may, in addition to any criminal and civil penalties, result in a withdrawal of RHCDS approval, or debarment. Examples of this type of deficiency include falsified Verifications of Employment, false certifications, reporting a delinquent loan as being current, and omitting conditions relating to the health and safety of a property.

(f) *Borrower noncompliance.* When the borrower receives unauthorized assistance due to an error or oversight, the Lender may continue with the guaranteed loan. More serious violations will be viewed on a case-by-case basis by the National office.

(g) *RHCDS error oversight.* When the borrower receives unauthorized assistance solely due to an error or oversight by RHCDS, the Lender may continue with the guaranteed loan.

§ 1980.399 Appeals.

The borrower and the Lender respectively can appeal an RHCDS administrative decision that directly and adversely impacts them. Decisions made by the Lender are not covered by this paragraph even if RHCDS concurrence is required before the Lender can proceed. Appeals will be conducted in accordance with the rules of the National Appeals Division, USDA.

(a) *Appealable decisions.* (1) The borrower and the Lender must jointly execute the written request for an alleged adverse decision made by RHCDS. The Lender need not be an active participant in the appeal process.

(2) The Lender only may appeal cases where RHCDS has denied or reduced the amount of a loss payment to the Lender.

(b) *Nonappealable decisions.* (1) The Lender's decision as to whether to make a loan is not subject to appeal.

(2) The Lender's decision to deny servicing relief is not subject to appeal.

(3) The Lender's decision to accelerate the account is not subject to appeal.

§ 1980.400 [Reserved]

Dated: March 22, 1995.

Michael V. Dunn,

Acting Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development.

[FR Doc. 95-11943 Filed 5-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-07-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94-NM-193-AD; Amendment 39-9231; AD 95-10-14]

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300-600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300-600 series airplanes, that requires repetitive mechanical and electrical inspections to detect chafing of electrical wiring; and repair or replacement of discrepant parts, and repositioning the looms. This amendment is prompted by reports of wire chafing in the forward avionic compartment. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent such chafing, which may lead to a short in the electrical circuits at the 104VU panel; this condition could result in unwanted depressurization, loss of wing de-icing, and loss of in-flight engine restart capability.

DATES: Effective June 21, 1995.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of June 21, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Slotte, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-2797; fax (206) 227-1320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300-600 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on January 4, 1995 (60 FR 384). That action proposed to require repetitive mechanical and electrical inspections to detect discrepancies; and repair or replacement of discrepant parts, and repositioning the looms.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Two commenters support the proposed rule.

One commenter requests that the proposal be revised to include removal of the avionics bay ladder as an optional terminating action for the repetitive inspections. The commenter states that removing the avionics bay ladder will prevent future chafing. The commenter states that it has removed the avionics bay ladder in accordance with the Airplane Maintenance Manual and will request an alternative method of compliance. The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request to revise the final rule. The FAA does not consider it appropriate to include various provisions in an AD applicable to a single operator's unique configuration of an affected airplane. Paragraph (b) of this AD provides for the approval of an alternative method of compliance to address these types of unique configurations.

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

This is considered to be interim action. The manufacturer has advised that it currently is developing a modification that will positively address the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. Once this modification is developed, approved, and available, the FAA may consider additional rulemaking.

The FAA estimates that 69 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$4,140, or \$60 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The total cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of

the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (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) 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. A final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

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

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (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. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

95-10-14 Airbus Industrie: Amendment 39-9231. Docket 94-NM-193-AD.

Applicability: All Model A300, A310, and A300-600 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For

airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (b) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent unwanted depressurization, loss of wing de-icing, and loss of in-flight engine restart capability, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 600 flight hours or 6 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, accomplish paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) Perform mechanical inspections to detect discrepancies, in accordance with paragraph 4.2.1. of Airbus All Operators Telex AOT 24-05, Revision 1, dated June 7, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,050 flight hours. If any discrepancy is detected, prior to further flight, repair or replace discrepant parts, and perform an electrical inspection in accordance with the AOT.

(2) Perform an electrical inspection to detect discrepancies, in accordance with paragraph 4.2.2. of Airbus All Operators Telex AOT 24-05, Revision 1, dated June 7, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 18 months. If any discrepancy is detected, prior to further flight, repair or replace discrepant parts, and reposition the looms, in accordance with the AOT.

(b) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(d) The inspections, repair, and replacement shall be done in accordance with Airbus All Operators Telex AOT 24-05, Revision 1, dated June 7, 1994. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Airbus

Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on June 21, 1995.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 9, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.
[FR Doc. 95-11907 Filed 5-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94-NM-146-AD; Amendment 39-9229; AD 95-10-12]

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111, -211, and -212 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A320-111, -211, and -212 series airplanes, that requires modification of the junction box and connector backshells of a certain electrical harness assembly. This amendment is prompted by a report indicating that traces of fungus and corrosion have been found on the electrical harness junction box of the thrust reverser. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent such corrosion, which could result in multiple faults in the thrust reverser position indication, and subsequent uncontrolled reduction of engine power.

DATES: Effective June 21, 1995.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of June 21, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Slotte, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113,

FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-2797; fax (206) 227-1320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Airbus Model A320-111, -211, and -212 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 1994 (59 FR 66493). That action proposed to require modification of the junction box and connector backshells of the electrical harness assembly of the thrust reverser.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the two comments received.

Both commenters support the proposed rule.

Since issuance of the notice, Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A320-71-1011, Revision 1, dated June 27, 1994. This service bulletin is essentially identical to the original issue, but contains certain editorial changes. The FAA has revised the final rule to include reference to this revision of the service bulletin as an alternative source of service information.

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule with the change previously described. The FAA has determined that this change will neither increase the economic burden on any operator nor increase the scope of the AD.

The FAA estimates that 50 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 24 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts will be supplied by ROHR, Inc. (the manufacturer of the junction box, connector backshells, and the electrical harness assembly) at no cost to the operators. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$72,000, or \$1,440 per airplane.

The total cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (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) 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. A final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

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

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (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. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

95-10-12 Airbus Industrie: Amendment 39-9229. Docket 94-NM-146-AD.

Applicability: Model A320-111, -211, and -212 series airplanes powered by CFM 56-5A engines equipped with an electrical harness assembly having part number (P/N) 238W0908-513; on which Airbus Modification 23693 (reference Airbus Service Bulletin A320-71-1011) has not been installed; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority