Aviation Administration 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:


Comments Due Date
(a) The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must receive comments on this airworthiness directive (AD) action by December 20, 2010.

|
| 1473M90P01 | 1473M90P02 | 1473M90P03 | 1473M90P04 |
| 1479M75P01 | 1479M75P02 | 1479M75P03 | 1479M75P04 |
| 1479M75P05 | 1479M75P06 | 1479M75P07 | 1479M75P08 |
| 1479M75P09 | 1479M75P11 | 1479M75P13 | 1479M75P14 |
| 9061M23P06 | 9061M23P07 | 9061M23P08 | 9061M23P09 |
| 9061M23P10 | 9061M23P12 | 9061M23P14 | 9061M23P15 |
| 9061M23P16 | 9224M75P01 |


Unsafe Condition
(d) This AD results from seven reports of uncontained failures of LPT stage 3 disks and eight reports of cracked LPT stage 3 disks found during shop visit inspections. We are issuing this AD to prevent LPT rotor separation, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the airplane.

Compliance
(e) You are responsible for having the actions required by this AD performed at each shop visit after the effective date of this AD, at which the LPT module is separated from the engine.

Cleaning the LPT Stage 3 Disk
(f) Clean the LPT stage 3 disk, using a wet- abrasive blast to eliminate residual or background fluorescence. You can find guidance on cleaning the disk in the cleaning procedure of CF6–50 Engine Manual, GEK 50481 72–57–02.

Inspecting the LPT Stage 3 Disk
(g) Perform a fluorescent penetrant inspection (FPI) of the inner diameter of the forward cone body (forward spacer arm) of the LPT stage 3 disk. You can find guidance on performing the FPI in the CF6–50 Engine Manual, GEK 50481 72–57–02.

Alternative Methods of Compliance
(i) The Manager, Engine Certification Office, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

ADDRESS:
Comments, identified by Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) 1212–AB20, may be submitted by any of the following methods:
- E-mail: reg.comments@pbgc.gov.
- Fax: 202–326–4274.
- Mail or hand delivery: Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–4026.

All submissions must include the Regulation Identifier Number for this rulemaking (RIN 1212–AB20). Comments received, including personal information provided, will be posted to http://www.pbgc.gov. Copies of comments may also be obtained by writing to Disclosure Division, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–4026, or calling 202–326–4040 during normal business hours. (TTY and TDD users may call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1–800–877–8339 and ask to be connected to 202–326–4040.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Catherine B. Klion, Manager, or Deborah C. Murphy, Attorney, Regulatory and Policy Division, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–4026.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 10, 2010 (at 75 FR 48283), Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC)

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION
29 CFR Parts 4062 and 4063
RIN 1212–AB20
Liability for Termination of Single-Employer Plans; Treatment of Substantial Cessation of Operations

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: PBGC is extending to November 12, 2010, the comment period on its proposed rule to provide guidance on the applicability and enforcement of ERISA section 4062(e), which provides for reporting of and liability for certain substantial cessations of operations by employers that maintain single-employer plans.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 12, 2010.

Related Information
(j) Contact Christopher J. Richards, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; e-mail: christopher.j.richards@faa.gov; phone: (781) 238–7133; fax: (781) 238–7199, for more information about this AD.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on October 8, 2010.

Peter A. White, Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Certification Office, and Christopher J. Richards, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office.

§ 39.13 [Amended]
published a proposed rule that would provide guidance on the applicability and enforcement of ERISA section 4062(e), which provides for reporting of and liability for certain substantial cessations of operations by employers that maintain single-employer plans. PBGC is extending the comment period until November 12, 2010, in order to give the public additional time to review and comment on the proposed rule. Issued in Washington, DC, this 15th day of October 2010.

Vincent K. Snowbarger,
Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

For Further Information Contact:
Raymond J.M. Wong, Director, Cost Accounting Standards Board (telephone: 202–395–6805; e-mail: Raymond_wong@omb.eop.gov).

Supplementary Information

A. Regulatory Process

Rules, Regulations and Standards issued by the Cost Accounting Standards Board (Board) are codified at 48 CFR Chapter 99. The Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) Act, at 41 U.S.C. 422(g), requires that the Board, prior to the establishment of any new or revised Cost Accounting Standard (CAS or Standard), complete a prescribed rulemaking process. The process generally consists of the following four steps:

1. Consult with interested persons concerning the advantages, disadvantages and improvements anticipated in the pricing and administration of Government contracts as a result of the adoption of a proposed Standard.
4. Promulgate a Final Rule.

The Board notes that the (b)(14) overseas exemption from CAS at 48 CFR 9903.201–1(b)(14) is not subject to the four-step process required by 41 U.S.C. 422(g)(1) because it is not a Cost Accounting Standard. The Board elects to follow those requirements in the OFPP Act, at 41 U.S.C. 422(g)(1), to consult with interested persons concerning the advantages, disadvantages, and improvements anticipated in the pricing and administration of Government contracts as a result of the adoption of any new or revised rule, prior to its promulgation.

B. Background and Summary

The Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), Cost Accounting Standards Board (Board), is today releasing a Notice of Proposed Rule (NPR) on a proposal to eliminate the exemption from the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) for contracts executed and performed entirely outside the United States, its territories, and possessions as codified at 48 CFR 9903.201–1(b)(14), the “(b)(14) overseas exemption.” The purpose of this NPR is to obtain input on whether the (b)(14) overseas exemption at 48 CFR 9903.201–1(b)(14) should be retained, eliminated, or revised.

Statutory Requirement

Section 823(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (NDAA FY 2009) requires the Board to: “(1) Review the inapplicability of the cost accounting standards, in accordance with existing exemptions, to any contract and subcontract that is executed and performed outside the United States when such a contract or subcontract is performed by a contractor that, but for the fact that the contract or subcontract is being executed and performed entirely outside the United States, would be required to comply with such standards; and (2) determine whether the application of the standards to such a contract and subcontract (or any category of such contracts and subcontracts) would benefit the Government.” A report must be provided to the appropriate committees of Congress containing: (1) Any revision to the cost accounting standards proposed as a result of the review required by section 823(a) and a copy of any proposed rulemaking implementing the revision; or (2) if no revision and rulemaking are proposed, a detailed justification for such decision.