m' = m, except for counterparties rated below BBB, where m' = 120

$$MIExp_m^{LG} = 1 \; if \left(\left(LTV_{ORIG} \times \frac{UPB_m^{LG}}{UPB_{ORIG}^{LG}} \right) < 0.78 \right) \text{ and the loan group comprises conventional loans}$$

$$MIExp_m^{LG} = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

0.78 (78%) = the LTV at which MI is cancelled if payments are current

* * * * *

3.6.3.6.5.1 * * *

[a] * * *

$$LS_m^{SF} = MAX\left[\left(\frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{DR_m}{2}\right)^{\frac{MQ}{6}}} + \frac{\left(\frac{MQ}{12}\times PTR_m\right)+F-MI_m}{\left(1+\frac{DR_m}{2}\right)^{\frac{MF}{6}}} + \frac{R-RP_m-ALCE_m}{\left(1+\frac{DR_m}{2}\right)^{\frac{MF+MR}{6}}}\right), 0\right]$$

[b] * * *

2. * * *

$$LS_m^{VA} = \max\left[\frac{1+F+\left(\frac{MQ}{12}\times PTR_m\right)+\left(R-RP_m\right)-0.30}{\left(1+\frac{DR_m}{2}\right)^{\frac{MF}{6}}}, 0\right]$$

* * * * *

Dated: June 10, 2008.

James B. Lockhart III,

Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.

[FR Doc. E8–13378 Filed 6–24–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4220–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

[Docket No. CE288; Special Conditions No. 23–228–SC]

Special Conditions: Embraer S.A. Model EMB–500; Full Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC) System.

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: These special conditions are issued for the Embraer S.A. Model EMB–500 airplane. This airplane will have a novel or unusual design feature(s) associated with the use of an electronic engine control system instead of a traditional mechanical 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 June 16, 2008.

Comments must be received on or before July 25, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Comments on these special conditions may be mailed in duplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Regional Counsel, ACE–7, Attention: Rules Docket CE288, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, or delivered in duplicate to the Regional Counsel at the above address. Comments must be marked: CE288. Comments may be inspected in the Rules Docket weekdays, except Federal holidays between 7:30 and 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter L. Rouse, Federal Aviation Administration, Aircraft Certification Service, Small Airplane Directorate, ACE–111, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; 816–329–4135, fax 816–329–4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA has determined that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable because these procedures would significantly delay issuance of the design approval and thus delivery of the affected aircraft. In addition, the substance of these special conditions has been subject to the public comment process in several prior instances with no substantive comments received. The FAA therefore finds that good cause exists for making these special conditions effective upon issuance.

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to submit such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket or special condition number and be submitted in duplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the Administrator. The special conditions may be changed in light of the comments received. All comments received will be available in

the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons, both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerning this rulemaking will be filed in the docket. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. CE288.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Background

On October 5, 2005, Embraer S.A. applied for a type certificate for their new Model EMB–500. The Model EMB–500 is a normal category, low-winged monoplane with ''T'' tailed vertical and horizontal stabilizers, retractable tricycle type landing gear and twin turbofan engines mounted on the aircraft fuselage. Its design characteristics include a predominance of metallic construction. The maximum takeoff weight is 9,965 pounds, the V_{MO}/M_{MO} is 275 KIAS/M 0.70 and maximum altitude is 41,000 feet.

The Embraer S.A. Model EMB–500 airplane is equipped with Pratt & Whitney Canada PW617F turbofan engines using an electronic engine control system instead of a traditional mechanical control system. Even though the engine control system will be certificated as part of the engine, the installation of an engine with an electronic control system requires evaluation due to critical environmental effects and possible effects on or by other airplane systems. For example, indirect effects of lightning, radio interference with other airplane electronic systems, shared engine and airplane data and power sources.

The regulatory requirements in 14 CFR part 23 for evaluating the installation of complex systems, including electronic systems and critical environmental effects, are contained in § 23.1309. However, when § 23.1309 was developed, the use of electronic control systems for engines was not envisioned. Therefore, the § 23.1309 requirements were not applicable to systems certificated as part of the engine (reference § 23.1309(f)(1)). Although the parts of the system that are not certificated with the engine could be evaluated using the criteria of § 23.1309, the integral nature of systems such as these makes it unfeasible to evaluate the airplane portion of the system without including the engine portion of the system.

In some cases, the airplane that the engine is used in will determine a higher classification (Advisory Circular (AC) 23.1309) than the engine controls are certificated for, which will require that the FADEC/DEEC (Digital Electronic Engine Control) systems be analyzed at a higher classification. As of November 2005 FADEC special conditions will mandate the classification for § 23.1309 analysis for loss of FADEC control as catastrophic for any airplane. This is not to imply that an engine failure is classified as catastrophic, but that the digital engine control must provide an equivalent reliability to mechanical engine controls.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.17, Embraer S.A. must show that the Model EMB–500 meets the applicable provisions of 14 CFR part 23, as amended by Amendments 23–1 through 23–55, thereto.

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 23) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model EMB–500 because of a novel or unusual design feature, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of § 21.16.

In addition to the applicable airworthiness regulations and special conditions, the Model EMB–500 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 pursuant to section 611 of Public Law 92–574, the ''Noise Control Act of 1972.''

Special conditions, as appropriate, as defined in 11.19, are issued in accordance with § 11.38, and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.17(a)(2).

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, the special conditions would also apply to the other model under the provisions of § 21.101.

Novel or Unusual Design Features

The Embraer S.A. Model EMB–500 will incorporate the following novel or unusual design features: Electronic engine control system.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to the Model EMB–500. Should Embraer S.A. 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 special conditions would apply to that model as well under the provisions of § 21.101.

Conclusion

This action affects only certain novel or unusual design features on one model (Model EMB–500) of airplane. It is not a rule of general applicability, and it affects only the applicant who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on the airplane.

Under standard practice, the effective date of final special conditions would be 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register**; however, as the certification date for the Embraer S.A. Model EMB–500 is imminent, the FAA finds that good cause exists to make these special conditions effective upon issuance.

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(g), 40113 and 44701; 14 CFR 21.16 and 21.17; and 14 CFR 11.38 and 11.19.

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 Embraer S.A. Model EMB–500 airplanes.

1. *Electronic Engine Control.*

The installation of the electronic engine control system must comply with the requirements of § 23.1309(a) through (e) at Amendment 23–55. The intent of this requirement is not to reevaluate the inherent hardware reliability of the control itself, but rather determine the effects, including environmental effects addressed in § 23.1309(e), on the airplane systems and engine control system when installing the control on the airplane. When appropriate, engine certification data may be used when showing compliance with this requirement; however, the effects of the installation on this data must be addressed.

For these evaluations, the loss of FADEC control will be analyzed utilizing the threat levels associated with a catastrophic failure.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on June 16, 2008.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E8–14383 Filed 6–24–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2008–0331; Directorate Identifier 2008–CE–009–AD; Amendment 39–15569; AD 2008–13–06]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 208 and 208B Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) Models 208 and 208B airplanes. This AD requires you to inspect the left and right wing wire bundle(s) and repair or replace damaged wire. This AD also requires inspecting the wire bundles for correct attachment to the anchor points and correcting any deficient attachments. This AD results from chafed wiring found on wire bundles in the left and right wings containing the auto-control wing de-ice system, fuel quantity indication, and low fuel annunciation on the Cessna 208B airplanes. Improper installation of wire bundle supporting hardware can cause chafed wiring in the affected bundles. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct damaged wiring of the auto-control wing de-ice system, fuel quantity indication, and low fuel annunciation systems. This condition could result in incorrect fuel quantity indications, loss of low fuel quantity annunciations, or loss of the autocontrol wing de-ice system.

DATES: This AD becomes effective on July 30, 2008.

On July 30, 2008, the Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in this AD.

ADDRESSES: To get the service information identified in this AD, contact Cessna Aircraft Company, One Cessna Boulevard, P.O. Box 7706, Wichita, KS 67277–7704; telephone: (316) 517–5800; fax: (316) 942–9006.

To view the AD docket, go to U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, or on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov.* The docket number is FAA–2008–0331; Directorate Identifier 2008–CE–009–AD.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel Hilton, Aerospace Engineer, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946–4173; fax: (316) 946–4107.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

On March 11, 2008, we issued a proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to certain Cessna Model 208 and 208B airplanes. This proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on March 17, 2008 (73 FR 14191). The NPRM proposed to detect and correct damaged wiring of the auto-control wing de-ice system, fuel quantity indication, and low fuel annunciation systems.

Comments

We provided the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. The following presents the comments received on the proposal and FAA's response to each comment:

Comment Issue: Allow More Time for Service Bulletin

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) comments that they believe the issuance of an AD on the wiring bundles of the Cessna 208 is premature. The AOPA comments that it believes a service bulletin is an effective way to correct the wiring bundle issues, and FAA should have allowed more time for the service bulletin, dated February 4, 2008, to be distributed to Cessna 208 owners and mechanics. The commenter adds that if after a reasonable amount of time the service bulletin is not appropriately addressing the safety concern, then the FAA could issue a special airworthiness information bulletin (SAIB) or an AD.

We do not concur with the AOPA comment. Mandatory service bulletins and their process thereof do not constitute rulemaking for owners/operators to complete the requested action. The only enforceable process to assure that the unsafe condition is properly addressed on all aircraft is through the rulemaking process, in this case an AD.

We are making no changes to the final rule based on this comment.

Conclusion

We have carefully reviewed the available data and determined that air safety and the public interest require adopting the AD as proposed except for minor editorial corrections. We have determined that these minor corrections:

- Are consistent with the intent that was proposed in the NPRM for correcting the unsafe condition; and
- Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this AD affects 512 airplanes in the U.S. registry.

We estimate the following costs to do the inspection:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane	Total cost on U.S. operators
1 work-hour × $80 per hour = $80	Not Applicable	$80	$40,960

We estimate the following costs to do any necessary repairs that would be required based on the results of the inspection. We have no way of determining the number of airplanes that may need this repair/replacement:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane
1 work-hour × $80 per hour = $80	$10	$90