

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 75, No. 78

Friday, April 23, 2010

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Parts 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, and 1131

[Doc. No. AMS-DA-09-0007; AO-14-A78, et al.; DA-09-02]

Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the producer-handler definitions of all Federal milk marketing orders to limit exemption from pooling and pricing provisions to those with total route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk products to other plants of 3 million pounds or less per month. The exempt plant definition will continue to limit disposition of Class I milk products to 150,000 pounds or less per month. A referendum was held and the required number of producers approved the issuance of the orders as amended.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 1, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gino M. Tosi or Jack Rower, Senior Marketing Specialists, Order Formulation and Enforcement Branch, USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, STOP 0231-Room 2971, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-0231, (202) 720-2357, e-mail addresses: gino.tosi@ams.usda.gov and jack.rower@ams.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule amends the producer-handler provisions of all Federal milk marketing orders to limit exemption from pooling and pricing to those with total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants of 3 million pounds or less per month. The

exempt plant definition will continue to limit disposition of Class I milk products to 150,000 pounds or less per month.

Accordingly, this final rule adopts proposed amendments detailed in the final decision (75 FR 10122).

This administrative action is governed by the provisions of sections 556 and 557 of Title 5 of the United States Code and, therefore, is excluded from the requirements of Executive Order 12866.

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule is not intended to have a retroactive effect.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674) (AMAA), provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the AMAA, any handler subject to an order may request modification or exemption from such order by filing with the Department of Agriculture (USDA) a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with the law. A handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After a hearing, USDA would rule on the petition. The AMAA provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has its principal place of business, has jurisdiction in equity to review USDA's ruling on the petition, provided a bill in equity is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

Regulatory Flexibility Act and Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Agricultural Marketing Service has considered the economic impact of this action on small entities and has certified that this rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. For the purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, a dairy farm is considered a small business if it has an annual gross revenue of less than \$750,000, and a dairy products manufacturer is a small business if it has fewer than 500 employees. For the purposes of determining which dairy farms are small businesses, the \$750,000 per year criterion was used to establish

a marketing guideline of 500,000 pounds per month. Although this guideline does not factor in additional monies that may be received by dairy producers, it should be an inclusive standard for most small dairy farms. For purposes of determining a handler's size, if the plant is part of a larger company operating multiple plants that collectively exceed the 500-employee limit, the plant will be considered a large business even if the local plant has fewer than 500 employees.

Producer-handlers are dairy farms that process their own milk production. These entities must operate one or more dairy farms as a pre-condition to operating processing plants as producer-handlers. The size of the dairy farm(s) determines the production level of the operation and is a controlling factor in the capacity of the processing plant and possible sales volume associated with the producer-handler entity. Determining whether a producer-handler is considered a small or large business is therefore dependent on the capacity of its dairy farm(s), where a producer-handler with annual gross revenue in excess of \$750,000 is considered a large business.

The amendments to the producer-handler provisions will obligate some large producer-handlers under the Federal milk marketing order system to the same terms as other fully regulated handlers of their respective orders provided they meet the criteria for qualification as fully regulated plants. Entities currently defined as producer-handlers under the terms of their order will be subject to the pooling and pricing provisions of the order if their total route disposition of fluid milk products and sales of packaged fluid milk products to other plants exceeds 3 million pounds per month.

Producer-handlers with total route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk products to other plants of 3 million pounds or less during the month will not be subject to the pooling and pricing provisions of any order as a result of this rulemaking. To the extent that current producer-handlers have route disposition of fluid milk products and sales of packaged fluid milk products to other plants outside of the order's marketing areas, such route disposition and sales to other plants will be subject to the pooling and pricing provisions of the orders if total

route disposition and sales to other plants cause them to become fully regulated.

If current producer-handlers have total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products of more than 3 million pounds during a month, such producer-handlers will be regulated under the pooling and pricing provisions of the orders like other fully regulated handlers. Such large producer-handlers will account to the pool for their uses of milk at the applicable minimum class prices and pay the difference between their use-value of milk and the blend price of the order to that order's producer-settlement fund.

While this may cause an economic impact on those entities with more than three million pounds of route sales and sales to other plants that are currently considered producer-handlers under the Federal order system, the impact is offset by the benefit to other small businesses. With respect to dairy farms whose milk is pooled on Federal marketing orders, such dairy farms who have not heretofore shared in the additional revenue that accrues from the marketwide pooling of Class I sales by producer-handlers will share in such revenue. All producer-handlers who dispose of more than three million pounds of fluid milk products per month will account to all market participants at the announced Federal order Class I price for such use.

To the extent that some large producer-handlers become subject to the pooling and pricing provisions of Federal milk marketing orders, such will be determined by their capacity as handlers. Such entities will no longer face the restrictions necessary to maintain producer-handler status and the resulting exemption from the pooling and pricing provisions of the orders. In general, this includes being able to buy or acquire any quantity of milk from dairy farmers or other handlers instead of being limited by the current constraints of the orders. Additionally, the burden of balancing their milk production is relieved. Milk production in excess of what is needed to satisfy their Class I route disposition and sales to other plants may receive the minimum price protection established under the terms of the Federal milk marketing orders. The burden of balancing milk supplies will be borne by all producers and handlers under the terms of the orders.

During May 2009, the month in which the public hearing was held, the Northeast order had 57 pool distributing plants, 10 pool supply plants, 16 partially regulated distributing plants,

13 producer-handler plants and 40 exempt plants. Of the 83 regulated plants, 49 plants or 59 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 13,050 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 628 farms or 5 percent were considered large businesses and 12,422 farms or 95 percent of dairy farms in the Northeast order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Appalachian order had 21 pool distributing plants, 1 pool supply plant, 2 partially regulated distributing plants, 1 producer-handler plant and 4 exempt plants. Of the 24 regulated plants, 21 plants or 88 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 2,516 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 159 farms or 6 percent were considered large businesses and 2,357 farms or 94 percent of dairy farms in the Appalachian order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Florida order had 11 pool distributing plants, 5 partially regulated distributing plants and 2 exempt plants. The order had no pool supply plants or producer-handler plants as of May 2009. Of the 16 regulated plants, 12 plants or 75 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 249 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 105 farms or 42 percent were considered large businesses and 144 farms or 58 percent of dairy farms in the Florida order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Southeast order had 22 pool distributing plants, 3 pool supply plants, 6 partially regulated distributing plants and 12 exempt plants. The order had no producer-handler plants as of May 2009. Of the 31 regulated plants, 28 plants or 90 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 2,992 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 187 farms or 6 percent were considered large businesses and 2,805 farms or 94

percent of dairy farms in the Southeast order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Upper Midwest order had 24 pool distributing plants, 53 pool supply plants, 2 partially regulated distributing plants, 5 producer-handler plants and 11 exempt plants. Of the 79 regulated plants, 37 plants or 47 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 15,336 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 1,001 farms or 7 percent were considered large businesses and 14,335 farms or 93 percent of dairy farms in the Upper Midwest order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Central order had 30 pool distributing plants, 12 pool supply plants, 1 partially regulated distributing plant, 7 producer-handler plants and 19 exempt plants. Of the 43 regulated plants, 35 plants or 81 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 3,600 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 413 farms or 11 percent were considered large businesses and 3,187 farms or 89 percent of dairy farms in the Central order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Mideast order had 22 pool distributing plants, 2 pool supply plants, 4 partially regulated distributing plants, 1 producer-handler plant and 17 exempt plants. Of the 28 regulated plants, 8 plants or 29 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 7,238 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 504 farms or 7 percent were considered large businesses and 6,734 farms or 93 percent of dairy farms in the Mideast order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Pacific Northwest order had 15 pool distributing plants, 8 pool supply plants, 13 partially regulated distributing plants, 5 producer-handler plants and 2 exempt plants. Of the 36 regulated plants, 20 plants or 56 percent were considered large business. Of the 657 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 326 farms or 50 percent were considered large businesses. Because the Pacific Northwest order already fully regulates producer-handlers with monthly route distribution in excess of three million pounds per month, the action will have a minimal effect on small farmers whose milk is pooled on the order.

During May 2009, the Southwest order had 19 pool distributing plants, 2 pool supply plants, 1 partially regulated distributing plant, 5 producer-handler plants and 2 exempt plants. Of the 79 regulated plants, 19 plants or 86 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 588 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 318 farms or 54 percent were considered large businesses and 270 farms or 46 percent of dairy farms in the Southeast order were considered small businesses. Most of these dairy farms, large and small, could benefit by receiving a higher blend price, if the monthly limit of 3 million pounds of total Class I route disposition and sales of packaged fluid milk to other plants is adopted for producer-handlers.

During May 2009, the Arizona order had 5 pool distributing plants, 1 pool supply plant, 15 partially regulated distributing plants and 1 exempt plant. The order had no producer-handler plants as of May 2009. Of the 21 regulated plants, 13 plants or 62 percent were considered large businesses. Of the 100 dairy farmers whose milk was pooled on the order, 95 farms or 95 percent were considered large businesses. Because the Arizona order already fully regulates producer-handlers with monthly route distribution in excess of 3 million pounds, the action will have a minimal effect on small farmers whose milk is pooled on the order.

As of May 2009, in their capacity as producers, 15 producer-handlers would be considered large producers as their annual marketings exceed 6 million pounds of milk (500,000 pounds per month). During the same month, 22 producer-handlers would be considered small producers. Record evidence indicates that as of March 2009, seven large producer-handlers had total route sales of two million pounds or more per month. Therefore, seven or fewer large producer-handlers could potentially

become subject to the pooling and pricing provisions of Federal milk marketing orders because of route disposition of more than three million pounds per month.

This final rule amends the producer-handler provisions of all Federal milk marketing orders to limit exemption from pooling and pricing to those with total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants of 3 million pounds or less per month. The exempt plant definition continues to limit disposition of Class I milk products to 150,000 pounds or less per month. Based on the above analysis, USDA has concluded that the amendments will not have a negative impact on small entities and may in fact benefit small and large dairy producers.

The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

A review of reporting requirements was completed under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). It was determined that these amendments would have minimal impact on reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements for entities currently considered producer-handlers under Federal milk marketing orders because they would remain identical to the current requirements applicable to all other regulated handlers who are subject to the pooling and pricing provisions. No new forms are proposed and no additional reporting requirements would be necessary.

This notice does not require additional information collection that needs clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) beyond currently approved information collection. The primary sources of data used to complete the forms are routinely used in most business transactions. Forms require only a minimal amount of information that can be supplied without data processing equipment or a trained statistical staff. Thus, the information collection and reporting burden is relatively small. Requiring the same reports for all handlers does not significantly disadvantage any handler that is smaller than the industry average.

Prior Documents in This Proceeding

Notice of Hearing: Issued April 3, 2009; published April 9, 2009 (74 FR 16296).

Recommended Decision: Issued October 15, 2009; published October 21, 2009 (74 FR 54383).

Final Decision: Issued February 18, 2010; published March 4, 2010 (75 FR 10122).

Findings and Determinations

The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth supplement those that were made when the orders were first issued and when they were amended. The previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and confirmed, except where they may conflict with those set forth herein.

The following findings are hereby made with respect to the Northeast and other marketing orders:

(a) Findings Upon the Basis of the Hearing Record

A public hearing was held with regard to certain proposed amendments to the tentative marketing agreements and to the orders regulating the handling of milk in the Northeast and other marketing areas. The hearing was held pursuant to the provisions of the AMAA and the applicable rules of practice and procedure (7 CFR part 900).

Upon the basis of the evidence introduced at such hearing and the record thereof, it is found that:

(1) The said orders as hereby amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the AMAA;

(2) The parity prices of milk, as determined pursuant to section 2 of the AMAA, are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the aforesaid marketing areas. The minimum prices specified in the orders as hereby amended are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest;

(3) The said orders, as hereby amended, regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and are applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial or commercial activity specified in, the marketing agreements upon which a hearing has been held; and

(4) All milk and milk products handled by handlers, as defined in the tentative marketing agreements and the orders as hereby amended, are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in milk or its products.

(b) Additional Findings

The amendments to these orders are known to handlers. The final decision containing the proposed amendments to this order was issued on February 18, 2010 and published in the Federal Register on March 4, 2010 (75 FR 10122).

The changes that result from these amendments will not require extensive preparation or substantial alteration in the method of operation for handlers. In view of the foregoing, it is hereby found and determined that good cause exists for making these amendments effective following June 1, 2010. (Section 553(d), Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. 551-559.)

(c) Determinations

It is hereby determined that:

(1) The refusal or failure of handlers (excluding cooperative associations specified in section 8c(9) of the AMAA) of more than 50 percent of the milk, which is marketed within the specified marketing areas, to sign a proposed marketing agreement, tends to prevent the effectuation of the declared policy of the AMAA;

(2) The issuance of this order amending the Northeast and other orders is the only practical means pursuant to the declared policy of the AMAA of advancing the interests of producers as defined in the orders as hereby amended; and

(3) The issuance of this order amending the Northeast and other orders is favored by at least two-thirds of the producers who were engaged in the production of milk for sale in the respective marketing areas.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Parts 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, and 1131

Milk marketing orders.

Order Relative to Handling

It is therefore ordered, that on and after the effective date hereof, the handling of milk in the Northeast and other marketing areas shall be in conformity to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of the orders, as amended, and as hereby amended, as follows:

For reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR parts 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, and 1131 are amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR parts 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, and 1131 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601-674, and 7253.

PART 1001—MILK IN THE NORTHEAST MARKETING AREA

2. Amend § 1001.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1001.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1005—MILK IN THE APPALACHIAN MARKETING AREA

3. Amend § 1005.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1005.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1006—MILK IN THE FLORIDA MARKETING AREA

4. Amend § 1006.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1006.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1007—MILK IN THE SOUTHEAST MARKETING AREA

5. Amend § 1007.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1007.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the

month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1030—MILK IN THE UPPER MIDWEST MARKETING AREA

6. Amend § 1030.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1030.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1032—MILK IN THE CENTRAL MARKETING AREA

7. Amend § 1032.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1032.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1033—MILK IN THE MIDEAST MARKETING AREA

8. Amend § 1033.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1033.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1124—MILK IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST MARKETING AREA

9. Revise § 1124.10 introductory text to read as follows:

§ 1124.10 Producer-handler.

Producer-handler means a person who operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, from which total route disposition and

packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds, and who the market administrator has designated a producer-handler after determining that all of the requirements of this section have been met.

* * * * *

PART 1126—MILK IN THE SOUTHWEST MARKETING AREA

■ 10. Amend § 1126.10 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1126.10 Producer-handler.

* * * * *

(a) Operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, and from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds;

* * * * *

PART 1131—MILK IN THE ARIZONA MARKETING AREA

■ 11. Revise § 1131.10 introductory text to read as follows:

§ 1131.10 Producer-handler.

Producer-handler means a person who operates a dairy farm and a distributing plant from which there is route disposition in the marketing area, from which total route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants during the month does not exceed 3 million pounds, and who the market administrator has designated a producer-handler after determining that all of the requirements of this section have been met.

* * * * *

Dated: April 19, 2010.

David R. Shipman,

Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2010-9402 Filed 4-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2009-0502; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-16273; AD 2010-09-08]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CJ610 Series Turbojet Engines and CF700 Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for GE CJ610 series turbojet engines and CF700 turbofan engines with AFT Technologies combustion liners, part number (P/N) AFT-5016T30G02. This AD requires removing from service, AFT Technologies combustion liners, P/N AFT-5016T30G02. This AD results from a report of an AFT Technologies combustion liner that released a large section of the inner combustion liner and reports of six combustion liners with premature cracks. We are issuing this AD to prevent premature cracks in the combustion liner, which could release pieces of the inner combustion liner. A release of pieces of the inner combustion liner could cause an uncontained failure of the engine turbine and damage to the airplane.

DATES: This AD becomes effective May 28, 2010.

ADDRESSES: The Docket Operations office is located at Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Norman Perenson, Aerospace Engineer, New York Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, NY 11590; *e-mail:* norman.perenson@faa.gov; telephone (516) 228-7337; fax (516) 794-5531.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposed to amend 14 CFR part 39 with a proposed AD. The proposed AD applies to GE CJ610 series turbojet engines and CF700 turbofan engines with AFT Technologies combustion liners, P/N AFT-5016T30G02 installed. We published the proposed AD in the *Federal Register* on September 9, 2009 (74 FR 46395). That action proposed to

require replacing combustion liners, P/N AFT-5016T30G02:

- Before they accumulate 200 hours-since-new (HSN) or 300 cycles-since-new (CSN), or
- Within 15 hours-in-service or 10 cycles-in-service, after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, if the combustion liner has already exceeded 200 HSN or 300 CSN.

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 AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone (800) 647-5527) is provided in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

Comments

We provided the public the opportunity to participate in the development of this AD. We have considered the comments received.

Agrees With the Proposed AD

One commenter agrees with the AD.

Request To Replace “* * * Other Products of the Same Type Design”

One commenter, AFT Technologies, asks us to replace “* * * other products of the same type design” with “* * * other products of the same manufacture.” The commenter feels “The A.D. inadvertently suggests that despite PMA approval to manufacture the subject part, it’s failure or potential for failure is the result of a design defect, as opposed to an equally possible manufacturing or assembly defect.” And that the AD requires clarification.

We do not agree that there is any need to distinguish between design and manufacture in the AD. The regulation that controls type design, 14 CFR part 21.31, defines type design as design and manufacture. In addition, we didn’t make any conclusion as to the cause of the excessive cracking. Determination of the cracking is the responsibility of the PMA holder. As stated in the discussion of the proposed rule, “The PMA holder has not been able to determine the cause of the premature combustion liner failure.” Also, the statement “* * * other products of the same type design” appears only in the NPRM preamble section “FAA’s Determination and Requirements of the Proposed AD.” That