§ 907.951 Navel Orange Regulation 651.

The quantities of navel oranges grown in California and Arizona which may be handled during the period March 13, 1987, through March 19, 1987, are established as follows:

(a) District 1: 1,859,408 cartons;

(b) District 2: Unlimited cartons;

(c) District 3: Unlimited cartons;

(d) District 4: Unlimited cartons.

Dated: March 11, 1987.

Ronald L. Cioffi,

Acting Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 87-5632 Filed 3-12-87; 9:02 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

---

7 CFR Part 908

[Valencia Orange Regulation 380]

Valencia Oranges Grown in Arizona And Designated Part of California; Limitation of Handling

AGENCY: Agricultral Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Regulations 380 establishes the quantity of California-Arizona Valencia oranges that may be shipped to market during the period March 13–19, 1987. The regulation is needed to balance the supply of fresh Valencia oranges with market demanded for the period specified due to the marketing situation confronting the orange industry.

DATES: Regulation 380 (§ 908.680) is effective for the period March 13–19, 1987. Comments due April 13, 1987.

ADDRESS: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the possible impact of volume regulations on small entities. Comments must be sent in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, Fruit and Vegetable Division, AMS, USDA, Room 2085, South Building, Washington, DC 20250. Comments should reference the date and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register** and will be available for public inspection in the Office of the Docket Clerk during regular working hours.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James M. Scanlon, Acting Chief, Marketing Order Administration Branch, F&V, AMS, USDA, Washington, DC 20250, telephone: 202/447-5697.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule has been reviewed under Secretary's Memorandum 15-12-1 and Executive Order 12291 and has been designated a "non-major" rule under criteria contained therein.

At the beginning of each marketing year, the Valencia Orange Administrative Committee (VOAC) submits a marketing policy to the Department which discusses, among other things, the potential use of volume and/or size regulations for the ensuing season. The committee's 1986–87 marketing policy contemplated the use of volume regulation this season. The Department reviewed that policy with respect to legal and administrative requirements and regulatory alternatives, in order to determine if the use of volume regulatons would be appropriate.

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), the Administrator of the AMS has considered the economic impact on small entities.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of business subject to such actions in order that small business will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, hereinafter referred to as the "Act", and rules issued thereunder are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf. Thus, both statutes have have entity orientation and compatibility.

Valencia oranges regulated under Marketing Order No. 908 are grown in Arizona and designated parts of California. For marketing order purposes, the production area is divided into three districts: District 1, representing Central California; District 2, representing Southern California; and District 3, representing Arizona and the southeastern desert area of California. In recent seasons, District 1 has accounted for around 40 percent of total production, District 2 over 50 percent, and District 3 around 7 percent. The early VOAC crop estimate of 59,000 cars is expected to be allocated among the districts in relative amounts close to these approximated percentages.

The three basic outlets for California-Arizona Valencias are the demestic fresh, export, and processing markets. The domestic fresh market is fairly static, receiving around 23,000 cars per year unless unusual conditions such as poor quality and/or abnormal crop sizes exist. Quantities utilized in the export market have ranged from 9,208 cars to over 13,000 cars in the past five years. Exports vary depending on facts such as the foreign monetary exchange rate, quality, orange sizes, and trade practices. The processing market is basically a residual outlet. Valencia oranges not sold fresh are either disposed of or utilized for products, such as orange juice. Estimated crop utilization for the 1986–87 season is 22,000 cars for domestic fresh markets, 12,000 cars export, with the remaining 25,000 going to processed and other outlets.

There are an estimated 115 handlers and 3,500 growers of California-Arizona Valencia oranges. Regulations issued under Marketing Order No. 908 are imposed upon handlers, as this is the only point in the distribution process where implementing such regulations is feasible. The weekly shipping allotments imposed upon handlers are ultimately passed onto the individual growers. Therefore, the growers themselves are regulated and the effects of such regulation are realized by the producers as intended by the Act.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) has defined small entities as those producers having annual gross revenues for the past three years of $100,000 or less and those handlers with gross revenues of $3.5 million or less. Aggregate industry data indicate grower revenue has averaged about $45,000 over the past three years, and handler revenue has averaged about $1.7 million. Based on these figures, it appears the average grower and handler of California-Arizona Valencia oranges may be classified a small entities.

Volume regulations issued under the authority of the Act and Marketing Order No. 908 are intended to provide benefits to both producers and consumers. Producers allegedly benefit in areas such as increased grower returns and improved market conditions. Reduced fluctuations in supplies and prices result from pre-planned shipping levels, resulting in a more stable market. Consumers are assured of a steady supply of Valencia oranges in the market throughout the marketing season. The chance of market shortages and gluts is reduced, thereby reducing the corresponding wide fluctuations in prices.

The direct costs of implementing weekly volume regulations are primarily administrative in nature. The majority of these costs would likely be incurred regardless of whether volume regulation is issued for the coming season. Weekly industry (committee) meetings would likely continue to be held, data collection and dissemination would continue, and administrative staff would remain. These functions are necessary in case future recommendations for regulation are made. For example, weekly allotments are calculated based on prior weeks' shipments which necessitates data collections. Perhaps reduced costs would be publication costs in the **Federal Register** and less time spent by USDA employees processing the weekly regulations.

Benefits and costs of issuing regulations are difficult to quantify, as indicated in various studies regarding effects of marketing orders and criteria for measuring the effects. However, based on the available information, it appears that the benefits of issuing volume regulations for the 1986–87 season would outweigh the direct costs. This applies to all entities regulated under the Valencia orange marketing, regardless of size. The AMS has determined that issuing regulations during the coming season will not adversely affect a substantial number of small entities, and has certified this finding with the Small Business Administration.

The Fruit and Vegetable Division of the AMS, however, encourage the submission of comments on economic impacts on small entities from all interested parties. The USDA's position on this certification of the regulatory action will be further evaluated in view of the applicable comments received.

The regulation is issued under Marketing Order No. 908, as amended (7 CFR Part 908), regulating the handling of Valencia oranges grown in Arizona and designated part of California. The order is effective under the Act (7 U.S.C. 601–674). The action is based upon the recommendation and information submitted by the VOAC and upon other available information. It is hereby found that this action will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

The regulation is consistent with the marketing policy for 1986–87. The committee met publicly on March 10, 1987, to consider the current and prospective conditions of supply and demand and recommended the quantity of Valencia oranges deemed advisable to be handled during the specified week. The committee reports that the market for Valencia oranges is poor.

It is further found that is is impracticable and contrary to the public interest is give preliminary notice, engage in public rulemaking, and postpone the effective date until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** (5 U.S.C. 553), because there is insufficient time between the date when information upon which this regulation is based became available and the effective date necessary to effectuate the declared policy of the Act. Interested persons were given opportunity to submit information and views on the regulation at an open meeting. To effectuate the declared policy of the Act, it is necessary to make the regulatory provisions effective as specified, and handlers have been notified of the regulation and the effective date.

List of subjects in 7 CFR Part 908

Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Agreements and Orders, Arizona, California, Oranges, Valencias.

PART 908—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 908 continues to read as follows:

Authority: (Secs. 1–19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601–674).

2. Section 908.680 is added to read as follows:

§ 908.680 Valencia Orange Regulations 380.

The quantities of Valencia oranges grown in Arizona and California which may be handled during the period March 13, 1987, through March 19, 1987, are established as follows:

(a) District 1: Unlimited cartons;
(b) District 2: Unlimited cartions;
(c) District 3: 104,109 cartons.

Dated: March 11, 1987.

Ronald L. Cioffi,

Acting Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 87–5633 Filed 3–21–87; 9:02 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 73

Requirements for Criminal History Checks; Correction

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a final rule amending 10 CFR Part 73 with regard to the implementation of a program for the control and use of criminal history data received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation as part of criminal history checks of individuals granted unescorted access to nuclear power facilities or access to Safeguards Information by nuclear power reactor licensees. This final rule was published on March 2, 1987 (52 FR 6310). This action is necessary in order to make several minor typographical corrections.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristina Jamgochian, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone: 301–427–4754.

In FR Doc. 87–4436, published in the **Federal Register** of Monday, March 2, 1987, make the following corrections:

1. On page 6310, in the second column, in the second complete paragraph under the heading "Summary of Public Comment," beginning in the fourth line, remove the words that read "the date of publication of this notice." and insert in their place following the word "on", "April 1, 1987."

§ 73.57 [Corrected]

2. On page 6314, in the second column, in the third line of § 73.57(b)(1), the word "the" should read "this", and in the 27th line, the word "result" should read "results".

3. On page 6314, in the third column, in the third line of § 73.57(b)(5), the word "a" should read "an" and the word "permanent" should be removed.

4. On page 6315, in the third column, in § 73.57(f)(3)(ii), in the second line, the word "data" should read "date".

Dated at Washington, DC, this 9th day of March, 1987.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John C. Hoyle,

Acting Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 87–5457 Filed 3–12–87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

12 CFR Part 563

[No. 87-215-B]

Regulation for Direct Investment By Insured Institutions

Dated: February 27, 1987.

AGENCY: Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

ACTION: Interim rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Home Loan Bank Board ("Board"), as the operating head of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation ("FSLIC"), is adopting an interim final amendment to its regulation governing investments by institutions the accounts of which are insured by the FSLIC ("insured institutions") in equity securities, real estate, service corporations, and operating subsidiaries ("direct investments"). On December 18, 1986, the Board issued an interim rule which amended this regulation, deferring the expiration of the rule from January 1, 1987 to March 15, 1987. Board Res. No. 86–1260, 51 FR 47061 (Dec. 30, 1986). Today's amendment defers the expiration of the rule from March 15, 1987 to April 15, 1987, in light of the

Board's adoption today of a final revised rule to become effective April 16, 1987. Board Res. No. 87-215.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina M. Gattuso, Staff Attorney, (202) 377-6649, or Karen Knopp O'Konski, Deputy Director, (202) 377-7240, Regulations and Legislation Division, Office of General Counsel; or Joseph A. McKenzie, Director, Policy Analysis Division, (202) 377-6763, or Donald J. Bisenius, Financial Economist, (202) 377-6766, Office of Policy and Economic Research; Federal Home Loan Bank Board, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 31, 1985, the Board adopted a new regulation governing direct investments by insured institutions. Board Res. No. 85-79-A, 50 FR 6912 (Feb. 19, 1985) (codified at 12 CFR 563.9-8) (hereinafter "current direct investment regulation"). The regulation created a process of supervisory review and approval by the Board's Principal Supervisory Agents ("PSAs") of certain types of direct investment and of aggregated direct investment above certain threshold amounts. The regulation includes qualitative criteria for investment by institutions in equity securities as well as diversification requirements applicable to investment in any one issuer of securities or in any one real estate project. The direct investment regulation was designed to allow institutions the flexibility to exercise their investment powers, as independently authorized by applicable law, in a manner that would expose neither the institutions themselves nor the FSLIC insurance fund to an unacceptable level of risk. At the same time, the Board sought to ensure that these institutions continued to fulfill their obligations to provide economical home financing.

Because of the complexity of the problems the rule sought to address, the Board believed it important to assess, after sufficient experience with the rule, whether the approach taken was effective in controlling risk and whether further regulatory action was required. 50 FR at 6927. Therefore, the direct investment rule was to expire on January 1, 1987 by its own terms.

On September 11, 1986, the Board proposed to amend the direct investment rule to defer its expiration from January 1, 1987 to January 1, 1989. Board Res. No. 86-962, 51 FR 32925 (Sept. 17, 1986) (hereinafter "September proposal"). The comment period for this proposal ended on October 17, 1986.

On December 18, 1986, the Board adopted an interim amendment to its regulation governing direct investments that deferred the expiration of the rule from January 1, 1987 to March 15, 1987. Board Res. No. 86-1260, 51 FR 47061 (Dec. 30, 1986). The Board also voted to reopen the comment period on the September proposal through February 6, 1987, and to hold a two-day public hearing to receive oral comments on this proposal. Board Res. No. 86-1291, 52 FR 80 (Jan. 2, 1987). The interim amendment deferred the rule's expiration date in order to provide the Board with sufficient time to more thoroughly evaluate the September proposal. On February 2, 1987, the Board again extended the comment period for the September 1986 proposal from February 6, 1987 through February 13, 1987. Board Res. No. 87-114, 52 FR 3669 (Feb. 5, 1987).

In response to the September 1986 proposal, the Board received a total of 155 comments from the public, including written statements submitted at the January public hearing. These comments were received from insured institutions, economic consultants, industry trade associations, law firms, state banking and legislative authorities, public interest groups, and members of Congress. Moreover, the Board received oral testimony from thirty-one industry representatives who participated in the public hearings held by the Board on January 29, and January 30, 1987. The issues and concerns raised by these oral and written comments have been thoroughly reviewed by the Board and are summarized in the final revised direct investment rule. Board Res. 87-215.

Description of the Interim Rule

Having carefully considered the issues raised in the oral and written comments responding to the September proposal, the Board, by Resolution No. 87-215, has determined to adopt the September proposal with certain modifications and clarifications, as set forth in the final rule. Although this final revised rule will become effective April 16, 1987, the current direct investment rule will expire on March 15, 1987. This interim rule is necessary in order to defer expiration of the current rule until the Board's final revised rule takes effect. To permit the current rule to lapse prior to the effective date of the final revised rule would result in a period of unregulated direct investment, which would generate uncertainty on the part of insured institutions as to the regulatory requirements and undermine the board's purpose of providing appropriate safeguards for direct investment through regulation, as explained in detail in the final revised rule. Accordingly, the Board hereby adopts an interim rule deferring the expiration of the current regulation until April 15, 1987.

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to section 3 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 604, the Board is providing the following regulatory flexibility analysis:

1. *Need for and objectives of the rule.* These elements are incorporated above in SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

2. *Issues raised by comments and agency assessment and response.* These elements are incorporated above in SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

3. *Significant alteratives minimizing small-entity impact and agency response.* As discussed in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** above, the requirements of the interim rule are based upon the Board's determination that, in light of the Board's adoption of a final revised direct investment rule which will not become effective until April 16, 1987, it is necessary to preserve appropriate safeguards in the interim by deferring the expiration of the current rule from March 15, 1987 to April 15, 1987.

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 153

Bank deposit insurance, investments, reporting and recordkeeping requirements, saving and loan associations.

Accordingly, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board hereby amends Part 563, Subchapter D, Chapter V, Title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below.

SUBCHAPTER D—FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

PART 563—OPERATIONS

1. The authority citation for Part 563 continues to read as follows.

Authority: Sec. 1, 47 Stat. 725, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421 *et seq.*); sec. 5A, 47 Stat. 727, as added by sec. 1, 64 Stat. 256, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1425a); sec. 5B, 47 Stat. 727, as added by sec. 4, 80 Stat. 824, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1425b); sec. 17, 47 Stat. 736, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1437); sec. 2, 48 Stat. 128, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1462); sec. 5, 48 Stat. 132, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1464); secs. 401-407, 48 Stat. 1255-1260, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-1730); sec. 408, 82 Stat. 5, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1730a); Reorg. Plan No. 3 of 1947, 12 FR 1981, 3 CFR, 1943-1948 Comp., p. 1071.

§ 563.9-8 [Amended]

2. Paragraph (h) of § 563.9-8 is amended by removing the date "March

15, 1987" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "April 15, 1987."

By the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Jeff Sconyers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 87-5414 Filed 3-12-87 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6720-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 86-CE-75-AD; Amendment 39-5579]

Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (BAe) Jetstream Model 3101 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new Airworthiness Directive (AD), applicable to BAe Jetstream Model 3101 Series airplanes, which requires an elevator cable life limitation on the autopilot elevator trim cable, ET1, failure of which causes a nose up trim selection indicated on the flight deck console indicator without affecting the elevator tabs. Since this failure is not easily detectable by inspection, a cable life limit is being introduced by BAe to prevent the possible loss of elevator trim control.

DATES: EFFECTIVE DATE: April 17, 1987. Compliance: Required as indicated after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

ADDRESSES: BAe Mandatory Alert Service Bulletin 22-A-JA861023 dated December 2, 1986, applicable to this AD may be obtained from Spares Manager, Product Support, British Aerospace plc, Civil Aircraft Division, Prestwick Airport, Ayrshire, KA9 2RW, Scotland. This information may be examined at the Rules Docket, FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Room 1558, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ted Ebina, Aircraft Staff, AEU-100, Europe, Africa and Middle East Office, FAA, c/o American Embassy, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium; Telephone (322) 513.38.30; or Mr. Harvey A. Chimerine, FAA, Project Support Staff Foreign, ACE-109, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; Telephone (816) 374-6932.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend Part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, to include an AD requiring an introduction of a life limit for the elevator trim servo cable, ET1, on certain BAe Jetstream Model 3101 airplanes, was published in the **Federal Register** on January 13, 1987 (52 FR 1338). The proposal resulted from one operator of a Jetstream Model 3101 airplane with an autopilot installation who experienced a failure of the elevator trim servo cable, ET1. The failure was no elevator trim tab movement with a nose up trim selection, although indicated on the flight deck center console indicator. Subsequent investigations by the manufacturer, British Aerospace, on the particular cable and on further samples of the cable from other operator aircraft, have revealed that the nature of the failure is fracture of the center strand of the cable, leading to loss of load-carrying capabilities of the cable, eventual separation and possible loss of elevator trim control. Since this failure mode is not easily detectable by inspection, it is therefore necessary to introduce a life limit for this cable. Consequently, British Aerospace issued BAe Mandatory Alert Service Bulletin 22-A-JA861023 dated December 2, 1986, which introduces a life limit of 2,000 hours time-in-service on the elevator trim servo cable to prevent the possible loss of elevator trim control.

The Civil Airworthiness Authority-United Kingdom (CAA-UK), which has responsibility and authority to maintain the continuing airworthiness of these airplanes in the United Kingdom, classified this Mandatory Alert Service Bulletin and the actions recommended therein by the manufacturer as mandatory to assure the continued airworthiness of the affected airplanes.

On airplanes operated under United Kingdom registration, this action has the same effect as an AD on airplanes certified for operation in the United States. The FAA relies upon the certification of the CAA-UK combined with FAA review of pertinent documentation in finding compliance of the design of these airplanes with the applicable United States airworthiness requirements and the airworthiness and conformity of products of this design certificated for operation in the United States.

The FAA examined the available information related to the issuance of BAe Mandatory Alert Service Bulletin 22-A-JA861023 dated December 2, 1986, and the mandatory classification of this Alert Service Bulletin by the CAA-UK, and concluded that the condition addressed by BAe Mandatory Alert Service Bulletin 22-A-JA861023 dated December 2, 1986, was an unsafe condition that may exist on other airplanes of this type certificated for operation in the United States. Accordingly, the FAA proposed an amendment to Part 39 of the FAR to include an AD on this subject.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to comment on the proposal. No comments or objections were received on the proposal or the FAA determination of the related cost to the public. Accordingly, the proposal is adopted without change. The FAA has determined that this regulation involves two airplanes at an approximate one-time cost of $560 for each airplane, or a total one-time fleet cost of $1,120.

The cost of compliance with the proposed AD is so small that the expense of compliance will not be a significant financial impact on any small entities operating these airplanes.

Therefore, I certify that this action (1) is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the final evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the regulatory docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption "ADDRESSES".

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aviation safety, Aircraft, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

PART 39—[AMENDED]

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends § 39.13 of Part 39 of the FAR as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g) (Revised, Pub. L. 97-449, January 12, 1983); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. By adding the following new AD:

British Aerospace: Applies to Jetstream Model 3101 (all serial numbers) airplanes equipped with Sperry SPZ-200B or SPZ-500 autopilot installation, certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

To prevent the possible loss of elevator trim control, accomplish the following:

(a) For all affected airplanes on which the autopilot elevator trim servo cable has accumulated 1,900 hours or more time-in-service (TIS), within the next 100 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD and