

agencies shall integrate the NEPA process “at the earliest possible time to ensure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values, to avoid delays later in the process, and to head off potential conflicts.”

RUS Response: The Agency believes that the proposed timing of the environmental process is still early enough in the planning stage to ensure decisions will reflect environmental values. Furthermore, the Agency believe that this process will result in fewer project delays, and will in fact, expedite the review process.

Issue 7: Three individuals and fifteen organizations commented that allowing rescission of funds if the results of an environmental review do not ultimately support to the Agency’s decision to obligate, does not undo the harm, error, or fatal bias that has already been introduced and tainted the process. Allowing agencies to reconsider and rescind a decision to obligate funds after review in no way corrects otherwise clearly unlawful application of NEPA. They argue that this approach would also leave the responsible agency official in the position of either taking away funding from an outside entity or pressuring the environmental review staff to expedite the process. The most likely, they argue, is shortchanging the environmental review process. The public commenting on such reviews will understand the initial decision has already been made, that bias has irrevocably attached, and that they are essentially asking the agency to “re-decide” the decision to obligate funds. Making a commitment prematurely may also cause harm to the applicant because the commitment may not be met, pending the outcome of the NEPA process.

RUS Response: The Agency believes that it will continue to make unbiased decisions on its environmental reviews, and that since 93 percent of reviews are finished before 10 days, the agency’s decision-making process will not be influenced.

Issue 8: Fifteen organizations commented that the arbitrary time limit for completion of the environmental review prior to the end of following fiscal year after obligation, conflicts with CEQ regulations that state that prescribed universal time limit for entire NEPA process is too inflexible and should be appropriate to individual actions. Therefore, they argue, the proposed time limits would result in rushed reviews to avoid rescinding funds.

RUS Response: The Agency does not believe that the completion deadline for the environmental review is arbitrary.

As mentioned earlier, it was selected as a time that would give applicants confidence in going forward with projects. In addition, the agency would not rush reviews to avoid rescinding, as its current rate of processing is already extremely efficient. Those projects that would require more time, are already the result of reviews outside of the Agency.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1970

Administrative practice and procedure, Buildings and facilities, Environmental impact statements, Environmental Protection, Grant programs, Housing, Loan programs, Natural resources, Utilities.

Accordingly, for reasons set forth in the preamble, part 1970, title 7, Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 1970—ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- 1. The authority citation for part 1970 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 6941 *et seq.*, 42 U.S.C. 4241 *et seq.*; 40 CFR parts 1500–1508; 5 U.S.C. 301; 7 U.S.C. 1989; and 42 U.S.C. 1480.

- 2. In § 1970.11, revise paragraph (b) to read as follow:

§ 1970.11 Timing of the environmental review process.

* * * * *

(b) The environmental review process must be concluded before the obligation of funds; except for infrastructure projects where the assurance that funds will be available for community health, safety, or economic development has been determined as necessary by the Agency Administrator. At the discretion of the Agency Administrator, funds may be obligated contingent upon the conclusion of the environmental review process prior to any action that would have an adverse effect on the environment or limit the choices of any reasonable alternatives. Funds so obligated shall be rescinded if the Agency cannot conclude the environmental review process before the end of the fiscal year after the year in which the funds were obligated, or if the Agency determines that it cannot proceed with approval based on findings in the environmental review process. For the purposes of this section, infrastructure projects shall include projects such as broadband, telecommunications, electric, energy efficiency, smart grid, water, sewer, transportation, and energy capital investments in physical plant and

equipment, but not investments authorized in the Housing Act of 1949.

* * * * *

Dated: September 16, 2019.

Misty Giles,

Chief of Staff, Rural Development.

Bill Northey,

Under Secretary, Farm Production and Conservation.

[FR Doc. 2019–20342 Filed 9–20–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. FAA–2019–0745; Special Conditions No. 23–297–SC]

Special Conditions: Diamond Aircraft Industries of Canada Model DA–62 Airplanes; Electronic Engine Control System Installation

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: These special conditions are issued for the Diamond Aircraft Industries of Canada (DAI Canada) Model DA–62 airplane. This airplane will have a novel or unusual design feature associated with installation of an engine that includes an electronic engine control system. The applicable airworthiness regulations do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for this design feature. These special conditions contain the additional safety standards that the Administrator considers necessary to establish a level of safety equivalent to that established by the existing airworthiness standards.

DATES: The effective date of these special conditions is September 23, 2019. The FAA must receive your comments by October 23, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Send comments identified by docket number FAA–2019–0745 using any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRegulations Portal:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the online instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- **Mail:** Send comments to Docket Operations, M–30, U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Room W12–140, West Building, Ground Floor, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

- **Hand Delivery of Courier:** Take comments to Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building,

Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC, between 9 a.m., and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

■ **Fax:** Fax comments to Docket Operations at 202-493-2251.

Privacy: The FAA will post all comments it receives, without change, to <http://regulations.gov>, including any personal information the commenter provides. Using the search function of the docket website, anyone can find and read the electronic form of all comments received into any FAA docket, including the name of the individual sending the comment (or signing the comment for an association, business, labor union, etc.). DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement can be found in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-19478).

Docket: Background documents or comments received may be read at <http://www.regulations.gov> at any time. Follow the online instructions for accessing the docket or go to the Docket Operations in Room W12-140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC, between 9 a.m., and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Pretz, AIR-691, Small Airplane Standards Branch, Policy & Innovation Division, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, MO 64106; telephone (816) 329-3239; facsimile (816) 329-4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Reason for No Prior Notice and Comment Before Adoption

The FAA has determined, in accordance with 5 U.S. Code 553(b)(3)(B) and 553(d)(3), that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are unnecessary because substantially identical special conditions have been subject to the public comment process in several prior instances such that the FAA is satisfied that new comments are unlikely. For the same reason, the FAA finds that good cause exists for making these special conditions effective upon issuance. The FAA is requesting comments to allow interested persons to submit views that may not have been submitted in response to the prior opportunities for comment.

Special conditions No.	Company/airplane model
23-282-SC ³	Pilatus Aircraft Ltd./Model PC-24.
23-292-SC ⁴	Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam S.P.A./Model P2012.

Comments Invited

The FAA invites interested people to take part in this rulemaking by sending written comments, data, or views. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the special conditions, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data.

The FAA will consider all comments received on or before the closing date for comments. The FAA will consider comments filed late if it is possible to do so without incurring expense or delay. The FAA may change these special conditions based on the comments received.

Background

On November 16, 2018, DAI Canada applied for FAA validation for a type certificate for its new Model DA-62, which includes installation of an electronic engine control (EEC) system—commonly referred to as a full authority digital engine control (FADEC). The Model DA-62 is a normal category, composite, cantilevered low-wing monoplane that seats six passengers and one pilot. Two Austro Engine GmbH Model E4P diesel engines each drive an MT 3 bladed propeller. The airplane has retractable tricycle landing gear, a Garmin G1000NXi avionics suite, and a maximum takeoff weight of 4,407 pounds.

The FAA type certificated Austro Engine GmbH Model E4P aircraft diesel engines (TC No. E00081EN) installed on the Model DA-62 use an EEC system instead of a traditional mechanical control system. Although the EEC is certificated with the engine, the installation of an EEC requires evaluation due to critical environmental effects and possible effects on or by other airplane systems such as indirect effects of lightning, radio interference with other airplane electronic systems,

and shared engine, airplane data, and power sources.

Sections 23.1306, 23.1308, and 23.1309 contain requirements for evaluating the installation of complex systems, including electronic systems and critical environmental effects. However, the use of EECs for engines was not envisioned when § 23.1309 was published. The integral nature of these systems makes it necessary to ensure proper evaluation of the airplane functions, which may be included in the EEC, and that the installation does not degrade the EEC reliability approved under part 33 during engine type certification. Sections 23.1306(a) and 23.1308(a) apply to the EEC to ensure it remains equivalent to a mechanical only system, which is not generally susceptible to the High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF) and lightning environments.

In some cases, the airplane in which the engine is installed determines a higher classification than the engine controls are certificated for, requiring the EEC systems be analyzed at a higher classification. Since November 2005, EEC special conditions have mandated the § 23.1309 classification for loss of EEC control as catastrophic for any airplane. This is not to imply an engine failure is classified as catastrophic, but that the EEC must provide an equivalent reliability to mechanical engine controls. In addition, §§ 23.1141(e) and 25.901(b)(2) provide the fault tolerant design requirements of turbine engine mechanical controls to the EEC and ensure adequate inspection and maintenance intervals for the EEC.

Part 23 did not envision the use of full authority EECs and lacks the specific regulatory requirements necessary to provide an adequate level of safety. Therefore, special conditions are necessary.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.17, DAI Canada must show that the Model DA-62 meets the applicable provisions of 14 CFR part 23, as amended by amendments 23-1 through 23-62 thereto.

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations in part 23 do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model DA-62 airplane because of a novel or unusual design feature, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of § 21.16.

The FAA issues special conditions, as defined in § 11.19, under § 11.38 and they become part of the type certification basis under § 21.17(a)(2).

Special conditions No.	Company/airplane model
23-253-SC ¹	Diamond Aircraft Industries/Model DA-40NG.
23-267-SC ²	Cirrus Design Corporation/Model SF50.

¹ http://rgl.faa.gov/Regulatory_and_Guidance_Library/rgSC.nsf/0/1A102658468C62D386257950004D7183?OpenDocument.

² <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/FR-2015-09-23/2015-24156/summary>.

³ <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/FR-2017-07-17/2017-14936>.

⁴ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/04/26/2019-08476/special-conditions-costruzioni-aeronautiche-tecnam-spa-model-p2012-airplane-electronic-engine>.

Special conditions are initially applicable to the model for which they are issued. Should the type certificate for that model be amended later to include any other model that incorporates the same novel or unusual design feature, or should any other model already included on the same type certificate be modified to incorporate the same novel or unusual design feature, the FAA would apply these special conditions to the other model.

In addition to the applicable airworthiness regulations and special conditions, the Model DA-62 must comply with the fuel vent and exhaust emission requirements of 14 CFR part 34 and the noise certification requirements of 14 CFR part 36; and the FAA must issue a finding of regulatory adequacy under section 611 of Public Law 92-574, the “Noise Control Act of 1972.”

Novel or Unusual Design Features

The Model DA-62 airplane will incorporate the following novel or unusual design features: The installation of an EEC system, which is the generic family of electrical/electronic engine control systems to include full authority digital engine controls, supervisory controls, and derivatives of these controls.

Discussion

This airplane makes use of an electronic engine control system instead of a traditional mechanical control system, which is a novel design for this type of airplane. The applicable airworthiness regulations do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for this design feature. Mandating a structured assessment to determine potential installation issues mitigate concerns that the addition of an electronic engine control does not produce a failure condition not previously considered.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the Model DA-62 airplane. Should DAI Canada apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, the FAA would apply these special conditions to that model as well.

Conclusion

This action affects only a certain novel or unusual design feature on the Model DA-62 airplane. It is not a rule of general applicability and affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA

for approval of these features on the airplane.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 23

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Signs and symbols.

Citation

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g), 40113, 44701–44702; Pub. L. 113–53, 127 Stat 584 (49 U.S.C. 44704) note.

The Special Conditions

■ Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the following special conditions are issued as part of the type certification basis for DAI Canada Model DA-62 airplanes.

Installation of Electronic Engine Control System

(a) For electronic engine control (EEC) system installations, it must be established that no single failure or malfunction or probable combinations of failures of EEC system components will have an effect on the system, as installed in the airplane, that causes the Loss of Power Control (LOPC) probability of the system to exceed those allowed in part 33 certification.

(b) Electronic engine control system installations must be evaluated for environmental and atmospheric conditions, including lightning and High Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF). The EEC system lightning and HIRF effects that result in LOPC should be considered catastrophic.

(c) The components of the installation must be constructed, arranged, and installed to ensure their continued safe operation between normal inspections or overhauls.

(d) Functions incorporated into any electronic engine control that make it part of any equipment, systems or installation whose functions are beyond that of basic engine control, and which may also introduce system failures and malfunctions, are not exempt from § 23.1309 and must be shown to meet part 23 levels of safety as derived from § 23.1309. Part 33 certification data, if applicable, may be used to show compliance with any part 23 requirements. If part 33 data is used to substantiate compliance with part 23 requirements, then the part 23 applicant must be able to provide this data for its showing of compliance.

Note: The term “probable” in the context of “probable combination of failures” does not have the same meaning as used for a safety assessment process. The term “probable” in “probable combination of

failures” means “foreseeable,” or those failure conditions anticipated to occur one or more times during the operational life of each airplane.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on September 11, 2019.

James Foltz,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Standards Branch, Policy and Innovation Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2019–20325 Filed 9–20–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

19 CFR Part 24

[USCBP–2019–0032; CBP Dec. No. 19–10]

RIN 1515–AE47

Amendment to Statement Processing and Automated Clearinghouse (ACH); Correction

AGENCY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Interim final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects an interim final rule published on September 5, 2019, in the **Federal Register**, which amended the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations regarding statement processing and Automated Clearinghouse (ACH) and made certain technical corrections to the CBP regulations. In the September 5, 2019, document, an amendatory instruction cited an incorrect sentence in a paragraph to be amended. This document corrects that error.

DATES: This correction is effective September 23, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kara Welty, Debt Management Branch, Revenue Division, Office of Finance, 866–530–4172, collectionscapabilityowners@cbp.dhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 5, 2019, CBP and the Department of the Treasury published the “Amendment to Statement Processing and Automated Clearinghouse (ACH)” interim final rule in the **Federal Register** (84 FR 46678), which became effective on September 7, 2019. The interim final rule amended