subject to a two-quarter grace period if they do not meet any of the eligibility criteria and may remain under the CBLR framework, provided that their leverage ratio is above seven percent during the grace period. Beginning in 2021, the CBLR requirement will be 8.5 percent or greater and the minimum requirement during the grace period will be 7.5 percent.\textsuperscript{30} Beginning in 2022, the CBLR requirement will return to nine percent and the minimum requirement during the grace period will return to eight percent.

In the preamble to the 2019 Supplemental Rule, the Board explained that it might consider a capital standard analog to the CBLR framework developed by the other banking agencies—referred to in this ANPR as CCULR. The CCULR approach would be based on the principles of the CBLR framework and, for complex credit unions that meet specified qualifying criteria and have opted into the approach, would provide relief from the requirement to calculate a risk-based capital ratio, as implemented by the 2015 Final Rule. In exchange, the qualifying complex credit union would be required to maintain a higher net worth ratio than is otherwise required for the well-capitalized classification. This is a similar trade-off to the one made by qualifying community banking organizations under the CBLR.

As noted above, the 2015 Final Rule is scheduled to take effect on January 1, 2022. Accordingly, a CCULR approach would be parallel to the 2015 Final Rule and would not take effect until January 1, 2022. Qualifying complex credit unions would not be able to opt into the proposed CCULR approach prior to this effective date.

In designing the CCULR, the Board would seek to further the goal of the FCUA’s PCA requirements by requiring that complex credit unions continue to hold capital commensurate with their risks, while minimizing the burden associated with complying with the NCUA’s risk-based capital requirement. The Board welcomes comments on a possible adoption of the CCULR and, in particular, seeks input on the following issues:

- **Question 5:** The Board invites comments on the merits of incorporating the CCULR in its capital adequacy regulations. Should the NCUA capital framework be amended to adopt an “off-ramp” such as the CCULR to the risk-based capital requirements of the 2015 Final Rule?

- **Question 6:** The Board invites comments on the criteria for CCULR eligibility. Should the Board adopt the same qualifying criteria as established by the other banking agencies for the CBLR? In recommending qualifying criteria regarding a credit union’s risk profile, please provide information on how the qualifying criteria should be considered in conjunction with the calibration of the CCULR level under question 7, below.

- **Question 7:** What assets and liabilities on a FICU’s Call Report should the Board consider in determining the net worth threshold? How should each of these items be weighted?

- **Question 8:** What are the advantages and disadvantages of using the net worth ratio as the measure of capital adequacy under the CCULR? Should the Board consider alternative measures for the CCULR? For example, instead of the existing net worth definition, the CCULR could use the risk-based capital ratio numerator from the 2015 Final Rule, similar to the “Tier 1 Capital” measure used for banking institutions.

- **Question 9:** Should all complex credit unions be eligible for the CCULR, or should the Board limit eligibility to a subset of these credit unions? For example, the Board could consider limiting eligibility to the CCULR approach to only complex credit unions with less than $10 billion in total assets.

- **Question 10:** The Board invites comment on the procedures a qualifying complex credit union would use to opt into or out of the CCULR approach. What are commenters’ views on the frequency with which a qualifying complex credit union may opt into or out of the CCULR approach? What are the operational or other challenges associated with switching between frameworks?

- **Question 11:** The Board invites comment on the treatment for a complex credit union that no longer meets the definition of a qualifying complex credit union after opting into the CCULR approach. Should the Board consider requiring complex credit unions that no longer meet the qualifying criteria to begin to calculate their assets immediately according to the risk-based capital ratio? Should the Board provide a grace period for these credit unions to come back into compliance with the CCULR and, if so, how long of a grace period is appropriate? What other alternatives should the Board consider with respect to a complex credit union that no longer meets the definition of a qualifying complex credit union and why? Is notification that a credit union will not meet the qualifying criteria necessary?

### VI. Timeline

As discussed above, the 2015 Final Rule will be effective January 1, 2022. The Board expects that any final rule developed in response to this ANPR would be issued before the effective date of the 2015 Final Rule. Accordingly, the Board expects that any notice of proposed rulemaking issued in response to this ANPR would be issued by midyear of 2021. Once comments are received, the Board will evaluate the comments and direct NCUS staff to move forward in drafting any proposed rule to meet this timeline.

### VII. Conclusion

The Board is committed to tailoring its capital requirements to the unique features of credit unions. The two approaches outlined in this ANPR are designed to accomplish this goal without reducing the effectiveness of the Board’s capital standards. The RBLR approach would replace the 2015 Final Rule risk-based capital requirements using relevant risk attribute thresholds that would require additional capital buffers. The CCULR would enable eligible complex FICUs to opt into a framework to meet all regulatory capital requirements. The Board invites comments on these two options, as well as on any other recommendations that might similarly accomplish the goals outlined in this ANPR. All comments will be considered in the development of a future proposed rule.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board, this 14th day of January, 2021.

Melane Conyers Ausbrooks,
Secretary of the Board.
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BILLING CODE P
Corporation (Mooney) Model M20V airplanes. This proposed AD was prompted by reports of short circuit and arcing of the alternator main power cable in the engine compartment. This condition, if unaddressed, could result in a fire hazard, loss of engine thrust control, and reduced control of the airplane. This proposed AD would require inspecting the alternator main power cable and the exhaust crossover tube for damage, replacing damaged parts as necessary, and installing an additional alternator cable clamp. The FAA is proposing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: The FAA must receive comments on this proposed AD by April 23, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to https://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
• Fax: (202) 493–2251.
• Hand Delivery: Deliver to Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this NPRM, contact Mooney International Corporation, 165 Al Mooney Road, North Kerrville, TX 78028; phone: (800) 456–3033; email: support@mooney.com. You may view this service information at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 901 Locust, Kansas City, MO 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329–4148.

Examining the AD Docket
You may examine the AD docket at https://www.regulations.gov by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2020–0991; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this NPRM, any comments received, and other information. The street address for Docket Operations is listed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Jacob Fitch, Aviation Safety Engineer, Fort Worth ACO Branch, FAA, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Fort Worth, TX 76177; phone: (817) 222–4130; fax: (817) 222–5245; email: jacob.fitch@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited
The FAA invites you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under ADDRESSES. Include “Docket No. FAA–2020–0991; Project Identifier AD–2020–00539–A” at the beginning of your comments. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the proposal, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. The FAA will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposal because of those comments.

Except for Confidential Business Information (CBI) as described in the following paragraph, and other information as described in 14 CFR 11.35, the FAA will post all comments received, without change, to https://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information you provide. The agency will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact received about this NPRM.

Confidential Business Information
CBI is commercial or financial information that is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. If your comments responsive to this NPRM contain commercial or financial information that is customarily treated as private, that you actually treat as private, and that is relevant or responsive to this NPRM, it is important that you clearly designate the submitted comments as CBI. Please mark each page of your submission containing CBI as “PROPIN.” The FAA will treat such marked submissions as confidential under the FOIA, and they will not be placed in the public docket of this NPRM. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Jacob Fitch, Aviation Safety Engineer, Fort Worth ACO Branch, FAA, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Fort Worth, TX 76177. Any commentary that the FAA receives which is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket for this rulemaking.

Background
The FAA received a report that two Mooney Model M20V airplanes had short circuit arcing of the alternator main power cable in the engine compartiment. Mooney determined the alternator main power cable was incorrectly positioned with slack in the cable and allowed contact between the alternator main power cable and turbocharger right-hand (RH) exhaust crossover tube. In one instance, this contact caused arcing of the alternator main power cable and created a hole in the RH exhaust crossover tube, which may result in a fire hazard. A damaged crossover tube may also decrease effectiveness of the turbochargers and cause complete loss of engine power at higher altitudes (above 9,000 ft. above sea level). This condition, if not addressed, could result in an inflight fire and loss of engine thrust control, which may lead to reduced control of the airplane.

Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51
The FAA reviewed Mooney International Corporation Service Bulletin M20–340C, dated February 14, 2020 (SB M20–340C). The service information specifies inspecting the alternator main power cable and the exhaust crossover tube for damage and replacing damaged parts as necessary. The service information also contains procedures for modifying the alternator main power cable routing by installing an additional alternator cable clamp, part number MS21919WCJ6.

This service information is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the ADDRESSES section.

FAA's Determination
The FAA is issuing this NPRM after determining the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop in other products of the same type design.

Proposed AD Requirements in This NPRM
This proposed AD would require accomplishing the actions specified in the service information described previously, except as discussed under “Differences Between This Proposed AD and the Service Information.”

Differences Between This Proposed AD and the Service Information
SB M20–340C specifies sending a compliance card to Mooney upon completing the actions in the service information. This proposed AD would not require that action.

Costs of Compliance
The FAA estimates that this AD, if adopted as proposed, would affect 18 airplanes of U.S. registry.

The FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this proposed AD:
The FAA estimates the following costs to do any necessary repairs/replacements that would be required based on the results of the proposed inspection. The agency has no way of determining the number of aircraft that might need these repairs/replacements:

### ON-CONDITION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Labor cost</th>
<th>Parts cost</th>
<th>Cost per product</th>
<th>Cost on U.S. operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace alternator main power cable</td>
<td>8 work-hours × $85 per hour = $680</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace exhaust crossover tube</td>
<td>8 work-hours × $85.00 per hour = $680</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FAA has included all known costs in its cost estimate. According to the manufacturer, however, some of the costs of this proposed AD may be covered under warranty, thereby reducing the cost impact on affected operators.

### 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.

The FAA is proposing 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

The FAA 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) Would not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and
(3) Would not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

### 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 airworthiness directive:


  (a) Comments Due Date

  The FAA must receive comments on this airworthiness directive (AD) by April 23, 2021.

  (b) Affected ADs

  None.

  (c) Applicability

  This AD applies to Mooney International Corporation Model M20V airplanes, serial numbers 33–0001 through 33–0018, certificated in any category.

- (d) Subject


- (e) Unsafe Condition

  This AD was prompted by reports of short circuit and arcing of the alternator main power cable in the engine compartment. The FAA is issuing this AD to prevent arcing of the alternator main power cable in the engine compartment. This condition, if not addressed, could result in an inflight fire and loss of engine thrust control, which may lead to reduced control of the airplane.

- (f) Compliance

  Comply with this AD before further flight after the effective date of this AD, unless already done.

- (g) Required Actions

  (1) Inspect the alternator main power cable and the exhaust crossover tube for burn marks, chafing, holes, and cracks, and replace any cable and crossover tube that has a burn mark, chafing, a hole, or a crack.

  (2) Install an additional alternator cable clamp part number MS21919WCJ6 and ensure correct routing of the alternator main power cable by following steps 1.5. through 1.9. of the Instructions in Mooney International Corporation Service Bulletin M20–340C, dated February 14, 2020.

- (h) Special Flight Permit

  A special flight permit may be issued with the following limitations:

  (1) Flights must not carry passengers;

  (2) Operation in daytime visual meteorological conditions only;

  (3) Straight and level flight must be maintained;

  (4) Operation in areas of known turbulence prohibited; and

  (5) Altitude limited to 9,000 ft. above sea level.

- (i) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

  (1) The Manager, Fort Worth ACO Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures
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Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The FAA is withdrawing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that proposed to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would have applied to certain Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206A, 206B, and 206B3 helicopters. The NPRM was prompted by the need for corresponding operating limitations prohibiting flight, including hover, with the litter doorpost removed when certain litter kits are installed. The NPRM would have required revising the Operating Limitations, Section 1, of the existing Rotorcraft Flight Manual (RFM) for your helicopter to add an operating limitation when a litter kit is installed to prohibit flight with the doorpost removed to prevent loss of structural integrity of the fuselage. Since issuance of the NPRM, the FAA has determined that an unsafe condition no longer exists. Accordingly, the NPRM is withdrawn.

DATES: The FAA is withdrawing the proposed rule published May 13, 2011 (76 FR 27958), as of March 9, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Examining the AD Docket


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristi Bradley, Aviation Safety Engineer, General Aviation & Rotorcraft Section, International Validation Branch, FAA, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Fort Worth, TX 76177; telephone (817) 222–5110; email kristin.bradley@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

The FAA has issued an NPRM that proposed to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to the specified products. The NPRM was published in the Federal Register on May 13, 2011 (76 FR 27958). The NPRM was prompted by the need for corresponding operating limitations prohibiting flight, including hover, with the litter doorpost removed when certain litter kits are installed. The NPRM proposed to require revising the operating limitations, and inserting a copy of the AD into the Rotorcraft Flight Manual (RFM) for your helicopter by inserting into the Operating Limitations, Section 1, of the existing RFM for your helicopter the following statement: “Flight, including hover, with litter doorpost removed is prohibited.” This revision would have been made by pen and ink changes, inserting a copy of this AD into the existing RFM for your helicopter, or inserting a copy of the RFM Supplement (RFMS) dealing with Litter Kits into the existing RFM for your helicopter as follows: For Model 206A helicopters—inserting Mo–206–100–FM–S–8, dated December 30, 2009, into Rotorcraft Flight Manual (RFM) BHT–206A–FM–1, dated July 2, 2009; for Model 206B helicopters—inserting RFMS BHT–206B–FMS–8, dated December 30, 2009, into Rotorcraft Flight Manual (RFM) BHT–206B–FM–1, dated July 2, 2009; and for Model 206B3 helicopters—inserting RFMS BHT–206B3–FMS–2, dated December 30, 2009, into Rotorcraft Flight Manual (RFM) BHT–206B3–FM–1, dated March 24, 2010. The proposed actions were intended to add an operating limitation when a litter kit is installed to prohibit flight with the doorpost removed to prevent loss of structural integrity of the fuselage.

Actions Since the NPRM Was Issued

Since issuance of the NPRM, reevaluation of current fleet safety data indicates that there is not an unsafe condition and AD action is no longer necessary. There are no recent records of safety issues related to this unsafe condition previously described. Therefore, the FAA has determined that AD action is not required. Withdrawal of the NPRM constitutes only such action and does not preclude the agency from issuing future rulemaking on this issue, nor does it commit the agency to any course of action in the future.

The FAA’s Aircraft Certification Service has also changed its organizational structure. The new structure replaces product directorates with functional divisions. We have revised some of the office titles and nomenclature throughout this proposed AD to reflect the new organizational changes. Additional information about the new structure can be found in the Notice published on July 25, 2017 (82 FR 43564).

Lastly, the identification of “Directorate Identifier 2010–SW–021–AD” has been changed to “Project Identifier AD 2020–01464–R.”

Comments

The FAA gave the public the opportunity to comment on the NPRM. The FAA received no comments on the NPRM or on the determination of the cost to the public.

FAA’s Conclusions

Upon further consideration, the FAA has determined that the NPRM is unnecessary. Accordingly, the NPRM is withdrawn.

Regulatory Findings

Since this action only withdraws an NPRM, it is neither a proposed nor a final rule. This action therefore is not covered under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979).