

amendment, (ii) obtain a favorable vote by the members, and (iii) notify the OTS of the adoption at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the proposed amendment. Unless the OTS notifies the institution of its objection to the proposed amendment within that 30 days, the amendment is automatically approved.

### III. Solicitation of Comments

The OTS is asking for comment on the proposal. Specifically, the OTS seeks comment on:

- Whether federal mutual savings associations would expect to encounter any corporate governance problems if they chose to reduce the maximum number of votes per member. For example, would the savings association encounter any difficulty in obtaining the necessary votes of members to take corporate actions?
- Whether existing federal mutual associations would find the added flexibility of an expanded voting requirement useful.
- Whether, and under what circumstances, a one vote per member limitation would either entrench or destabilize management.
- Whether by imposing such a limitation, federal associations with a higher minimum vote requirement that adopt a lower minimum vote requirement could risk legal actions by account holders.
- Whether the proposed revision should be continued as a preapproved charter amendment, or whether savings associations that seek to adjust the number of votes per member should be required to submit an application to the OTS.

### IV. Executive Order 12866

The Director of the OTS has determined that this proposed rule does not constitute a "significant regulatory action" for the purposes of Executive Order 12866.

### V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

Pursuant to Section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the OTS certifies that this proposal will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities utilizing the regulation may be able to retain their existing membership rights, which will simplify the process of converting to a federal charter and reduce regulatory burden.

### VI. Unfunded Mandates Act of 1995

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-4 (Unfunded Mandates Act), requires that an agency prepare a

budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes a federal mandate that may result in expenditures by state, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, or \$100 million or more in any one year. If a budgetary impact statement is required, Section 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act also requires an agency to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives before promulgating a rule. The OTS has determined that the proposed rule will not result in expenditures by state, local, or tribal governments or by the private sector of \$100 million or more. Accordingly, this rulemaking is not subject to Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Act.

### List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 544

Bylaws, Charters, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, savings associations.

Accordingly, the Office of Thrift Supervision proposes to amend chapter V, title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below:

### PART 544—CHARTER AND BYLAWS

1. The authority citation for part 544 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 12 U.S.C. 1462, 1462a, 1463, 1464, 1467a, 2901 *et seq.*

2. Section 544.2 is amended by revising the last sentence of paragraph (b)(4) to read as follows:

#### § 544.2 Charter amendments.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(4) \* \* \* [Fill in a number from 1 to 1000.]

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: March 31, 1998.

By the Office of Thrift Supervision.

**Ellen Seidman,**  
Director.

[FR Doc. 98-9765 Filed 4-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6720-01-P

### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

#### 13 CFR Parts 121, 125, and 126

#### HUBZone Empowerment Contracting Program; Correction

**AGENCY:** Small Business Administration.  
**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects the preamble and the text of a proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** of April 2, 1998, regarding the HUBZone Empowerment Contracting Program (hereinafter the HUBZone program).

This correction amends the preamble and proposed § 126.616 by including language inadvertently omitted from the proposal.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Michael McHale, (202) 205-6731.

### Correction

In proposed rule, FR Doc. 98-8585, beginning on page 16148 in the **Federal Register** of April 2, 1998, make the following corrections:

1. In the Supplementary Information section, on page 16152 in the third column, replace the first paragraph with the following:

"Proposed § 126.616(b) explains the size standards applicable to such joint ventures. A joint venture of at least one qualified HUBZone SBC and another qualified HUBZone SBC, an 8(a) participant, or a woman-owned small business concern may submit an offer for a HUBZone procurement so long as each concern is small under the size standard corresponding to the SIC code assigned to the contract, provided: (1) for a procurement with a revenue-based size standard, the procurement exceeds half the size standard corresponding to the SIC code assigned to the contract; and (2) for a procurement having an employee-based size standard, the procurement exceeds \$10 million. On August 14, 1997, SBA proposed a similar rule for the 8(a) program. Although the final rule for the 8(a) program has yet to be published, SBA anticipates that the final rule will be the same on this issue. To achieve consistency within its program, SBA modeled this section of the proposed rule after § 124.512 of the 8(a) program proposed rule."

2. On page 16161 in the third column § 126.616(b) is corrected to read as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) Size of concerns. A joint venture of at least one qualified HUBZone SBC and an 8(a) participant or a woman-owned small business concern may submit an offer for a HUBZone procurement so long as each concern is small under the size standard corresponding to the SIC code assigned to the contract, provided:

(1) For a procurement having a revenue-based size standard, the procurement exceeds half the size standard corresponding to the SIC code assigned to the contract; and

(2) For a procurement having an employee-based size standard, the procurement exceeds \$10 million.

Dated: April 8, 1998.

**David R. Kohler,**

*Acting General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 98-9809 Filed 4-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97-CE-27-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### **Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. MU-2B Series Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to certain Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. (Mitsubishi) MU-2B series airplanes. The proposed action would require repetitively inspecting the cockpit windshield and cabin window surfaces for damage (damage would be defined as crazing, scratches, and cracks). If any of the windshield or window surfaces have damage that exceeds certain limits, the proposed AD would require replacing the windshield or window. If the damage does not exceed certain limits, then the proposed AD would allow blending out the damage following maintenance manual procedures. The proposed AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Japan. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent cockpit windshield or cabin window separation during flight, which could result in engine ingestion of glass, wing skin damage, or propeller damage, and possible loss of control of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 11, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97-CE-27-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.,

Nagoya Aerospace Systems Works, 10. OYE-CHO, MINATO-KU, Nagoya, Japan, telephone: NAGOYA (611) 2141, telex: 4464561HISI. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. William Roberts, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, California, 90712; telephone (562) 627-5224; facsimile (562) 627-5228.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Comments Invited**

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket No. 97-CE-27-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

##### **Availability of NPRMs**

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97-CE-27-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

##### **Discussion**

The Japanese Civil Airworthiness Bureau (JCAB), which is the airworthiness authority for Japan, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes. The

JCAB reports that several Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes have had windshield or window separation during flight. Separation would be defined as shattering glass. Further analysis shows that the separation is happening as a result of repeated cabin pressurization cycles. These conditions, if not corrected, could result in shattering or separation of the cockpit windshield or cabin windows during flight, which could cause loss of control of the airplane.

##### **Relevant Service Information**

Mitsubishi has issued MU-2 Service Bulletin (SB) No. 224, dated June 30, 1995, and MU-2 SB No. 224A, dated October 30, 1995, which specifies procedures for repetitively inspecting and repairing or replacing the cockpit windshield (part numbers (P/N) 010A-31450-1/-2, P/N 010A-31451-1/-2, and P/N 010A-81874-1/-2 or an FAA-approved equivalent part number) or cabin windows (P/N 010A-31870, P/N 010A-31870-11, and P/N 030A-32402, or an FAA-approved equivalent part number), depending on the extent of the scratching, crazing, or cracking. If the scratching, crazing, or cracking is within the acceptable limits called out in Table 1 of the service bulletin, the procedure for repairing or blending out any damage is found in Chapter 3 of the Mitsubishi maintenance manual.

The JCAB classified these service bulletins as mandatory and issued AD No. TCD-4311-95, dated November 15, 1995, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in Japan. The Japanese AD confirms that the cause of glass shattering is the repeated pressurization of the airplane cabin, and refers the operators to the Mitsubishi service bulletins for inspection and repair instructions, but the AD did not cite the incidents of shattered windows on the MU-2B series airplanes during flight as the reason for the issuance of the JCAB AD.

##### **The FAA's Determination**

These Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes are manufactured in Japan and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the JCAB has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the JCAB, reviewed all available information including the service information referenced above, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of