

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 53, No. 194

Thursday, October 6, 1988

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 Part 987

[Docket No. FV-88-117]

Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, CA; Final Rule Changing the Conversion Factor Used To Compute the Whole Date Equivalent Weight of Pitted Dates

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule changes the conversion factor used to convert the weight of pitted dates to their whole date equivalent. Currently, the weight of pitted dates is converted to whole date weight by dividing the weight of pitted dates by 0.875. This final rule changes the conversion factor to 0.83. This change will result in more precise inventory, sales, and shipment reports. Carryover determinations and assessment determinations will also be affected.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 6, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Packnett, Marketing Order Administration Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, AMS, USDA, P.O. Box 96456, Room 2525-S, Washington, DC 20090-6456, telephone 202-475-3862.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule is issued under Marketing Order No. 987 (7 CFR Part 987), regulating the handling of domestic dates produced or packed in Riverside County, California. This order is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), hereinafter referred to as the Act.

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12291 and Departmental Regulation 1512-1 and has

been determined to be a "non-major" rule under criteria contained therein.

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this final rule 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 businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to 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 small entity orientation and compatibility.

There are approximately 26 handlers of California dates regulated under this marketing order, and approximately 135 date producers in California. Small agricultural producers have been defined by the Small Business Administration (13 CFR 121.2) as those having annual gross revenues for the last three years of less than \$500,000, and small agricultural service firms are defined as those whose gross annual receipts are less than \$3,500,000. The majority of the date handlers and producers may be classified as small entities.

Notice of this action was published in the Federal Register on September 2, 1988 (53 FR 34108). The comment period ended September 19, 1988. No comments were received.

This final rule changes § 987.105 of Subpart—Administrative Rules (7 CFR 987.101-987.172). That section specifies a conversion factor of 0.875 for use in computing the whole date equivalent weight of pitted dates. The weight of pitted dates is converted to whole date weight by dividing the weight of the pitted dates by that factor. The current factor has been in place since the late 1960's.

The current conversion factor is based on a weight loss resulting from the removal of the pit, estimated at 12.5 percent of the whole date weight. However, the 12.5 percent represents the weight of the pit only, and does not account for all of the date flesh lost in the pitting process. Use of the updated conversion factor (0.83) will result in more precise sales, shipment, and inventory reports. Carryover

determinations completed on a whole date weight would be affected. Use of the updated factor will also affect assessment weight obligations for pitted dates because the assessment obligations of date handlers are computed on a whole date weight basis.

At a meeting held on June 27, 1988, the committee unanimously recommended that the conversion factor be changed from 0.875 to 0.83, effective at the beginning of the 1988 crop year. Handlers of pitted dates furnished information to the committee indicating that the weight loss resulting from the pitting process ranges from 15 to 19 percent with an average of 17 percent. The conversion factor of 0.83 is based on a 17 percent weight loss. The committee stated that the 0.83 conversion factor will more accurately reflect the weight loss resulting during the pitting process. Updating the conversion factor will not add to or complicate handlers reporting requirements.

Based on available information, the Administrator of AMS has determined that the issuance of this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

After consideration of all relevant information presented, including the recommendation submitted by the committee, and other information, it is found that this action, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

It is further found and determined that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this action until 30 days after publication in the Federal Register (5 U.S.C. 553). It is important that the conversion factor be in effect at the beginning of the 1988-89 crop year, so that all 1988-89 shipments of pitted dates are converted to whole date equivalents using the updated factor. Moreover, no comments were received questioning the need for the new factor.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 987

Marketing agreements and orders, Dates, California.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, § 987.105 of Subpart—Administrative Rules (7 CFR 987.101-987.172) is revised as follows:

PART 987—DOMESTIC DATES PRODUCED OR PACKED IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 987 continues to read as follows:

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

Note: The following change will be published in the Code of Federal Regulations.

2. Section 987.105 is revised to read as follows:

§ 987.105 Whole equivalent of pitted dates.

For the purposes of this part, the whole date equivalent weight of pitted dates shall be determined by dividing the weight of the pitted dates by 0.83.

Dated: October 3, 1988.

Robert C. Keeney,

Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.

[FR Doc. 88-23020 Filed 10-5-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

Rural Electrification Administration

7 CFR Part 1736

Electric Standards and Specifications

AGENCY: Rural Electrification Administration, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Rural Electrification Administration (REA) amends 7 CFR Part 1736, Electric Standards and Specifications, by revising REA Bulletin 50-1, Electric Transmission Specifications and Drawings. This revised bulletin contains construction specifications and drawings for 115 kV to 230 kV transmission structures. REA Bulletin 50-2 contains up-to-date construction specifications and drawings for 34.5 kV to 69 kV. Bulletins 50-1 and 50-2 will replace Bulletin 50-1 (REA Form 805) which covered 34.5 kV to 230 kV structures.

The new bulletin will provide: (1) A common format for all structures and assemblies; (2) strength information for some assemblies; (3) clear construction details; (4) several new structures; (5) additional guying attachments and assemblies; and (6) expanded specifications to reflect state-of-the-art practices. The new Bulletin 50-1 when combined with a completed REA Form 831, Electric Transmission Construction Contract, will provide a transmission line bidding specification package.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 6, 1988. The incorporation by reference of the publications mentioned in this rule has been approved by the Director, Office of

the Federal Register, effective July 12, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Donald G. Heald, Structural Engineer, Transmission Branch, Electric Staff Division, Rural Electrification Administration, Room 1246, Washington, DC 20250, telephone 202-382-9086. The Final Impact Statement describing the options considered in developing these rules and the impact of implementing the chosen option are available on request from Mr. Donald G. Heald at the above address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 as amended (7 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*), the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) is amending 7 CFR Part 1736, Electric Standards and Specifications, by revising REA Bulletin 50-1. This action has been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12291, Federal Regulation. The action will not (1) have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; (2) result in a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, state or local government agencies; or (3) result in significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment or productivity, and therefore, has been determined to be "not major." REA has concluded that promulgation of this rule will not represent a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* (1976)) and, therefore, does not require an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment.

This regulation contains no information or recordkeeping requirements which require approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

This action does not fall within the scope of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance as 10.850, Rural Electrification Loans and Loan Guarantees. For the reasons set forth in the final rule related Notice to 7 CFR Part 3015 Subpart V in 50 FR 47034, November 14, 1985, this program is excluded from the scope of Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with state and local officials.

Background

The Rural Electrification Administration (REA) maintains a system of bulletins which contain construction standards and specifications for materials and

equipment applicable to electric system facilities constructed in accordance with the REA loan contract. These standards and specifications contain REA's requirements for construction units and material items and equipment units commonly used in REA Electric borrower's systems. REA Bulletin 50-1, Electric Transmission Specifications and Drawings, for 115 kV to 230 kV contains construction specifications and drawings for lower voltage transmission lines.

A notice of the proposed rulemaking was published in the *Federal Register* on June 11, 1982. Interested parties were given sixty (60) days in which to express their views on the proposed rule. However, comments reviewed after that date were still considered. Comments were received from several consultants, manufacturers, and REA cooperatives. A sampling of comments received are as follows:

a. One person suggested that a preconstruction conference should be made an integral part of the specifications in order that certain agreements can be reached between the owner, contractor, and engineer, e.g., (1) who can act for the owner; (2) who represents the contractors in the field; and (3) who is responsible for approving the performance of the contractor.

Preconstruction meetings are an excellent idea and are encouraged by REA. However, the above information should be part of the front-end documents. The instructions to this bulletin indicate that the user of the construction specification and drawings must add front-end documents including any supplemental instructions to the bidders and any general conditions.

b. Another party suggested that items to be "filled in" by the engineer be kept to a minimum. A supplement should be made containing all the data that would be provided by the engineer. For example, the blanks for the "fill in" on page 1 and page 27 should be filled in for the specific project under consideration at the time the specification is being used.

In the *Instructions*, Section C. information to be completed, summarizes the actions which must be taken by the user of these specifications and drawings. Included in Section C.1, is a check list of pages in the specification which are to be completed. Section C.2 summarizes the items which must be completed in the drawings. It is intended that these items be completed or "filled in" for a specific project.

c. In the *General* section, two people commented on the safety paragraphs. One party suggested that the

specification should clearly spell out that neither the owner nor engineer is responsible for the contractor's observance of safe working practices on the project.

Paragraph 2 of the *Safety* section indicates this. A paragraph was added to require the contractor to maintain a safety program for the duration of the contract. The program is to be supervised and enforced by an employee of the contractor.

d. Concerning *Access*, Section III, one person suggested that the contractor be made aware of all special requirements set forth in easements.

REA set up the construction specification such that any special requirements would be noted at the end of the appropriate section.

e. In one instance, it was suggested that removal of the gate units, Paragraph 13.5, be taken out of this section. With a permanent easement, all gates installed are left for maintenance in the future. Also a bid item should be included for the gate installation because many times the exact number of gates required is not known and may vary considerably from the initial estimates.

Paragraph B.1 was changed to indicate that all material and labor required for gate installations will be furnished by the contractor per bid unit. If additional units are necessary than those shown in the bid documents, then additional units as well as deletion of units, should be per bid unit. It is recognized that most gates installed during construction will remain, but in cases where the gates must be removed and the fence restored, it is the intention of the specification to include in the unit price for gate installation, the cost of gate removal and fence restoration. The wording of Paragraph B.5 has been changed to read, "In those cases as determined by the engineer, the contractor shall remove the gate and restore the fence."

f. Concerning access roads, one commentor indicated that he could not believe that any contractor would come in and place fill in 1-foot layers. He felt that access roads exist principally to allow the contractor to move equipment onto the site to construct the project and he will build an access road suitable for travel of his equipment. The specification was changed to indicate that the fill will be compacted by suitable heavy construction equipment. Any other provisions concerning compaction should be shown on additional drawings concerning access roads or in the *Special Requirements* section at the end of the section.

g. Under Section IV, Pole Inspection, Handling and Distribution, several

people suggested eliminating reference to REA Specification DT-5C, REA Specification for Wood Poles, Stubs and Anchor Logs. Also one person suggested that poles be supported every 20 feet.

Both suggestions were incorporated in the specification.

h. Several comments concerned the practice of saving extra heavy choice, chose-grained poles for angles, deadends and crossings. They either felt that this requirement should be directed to the pole supplier or that it wasn't needed since these poles are guyed.

The practice of having the contractor use extra heavy choice, and close grained poles at angles and deadends is appropriate if the project is a turnkey job and the poles are being supplied by the contractor. The use of these poles at the stated locations is to better utilize project resources.

i. Two people commented that field gaining of the pole should not be acceptable. During construction of H-frame lines, problems occur due to insufficient quantities of the correct size of fixed and/or adjustable spacers or the matching of replacement poles. The contractor generally will request or make an attempt to field gain the poles in order to use existing materials.

Although field gaining saves construction time, it may cost the owner years of pole life. As a result, prohibiting field gaining will be included in the *Structure Assembly* section.

j. Because grid gain seating jacks are no longer available, one person proposed that grid gains be seated by a combination of tightening the assembly bolts and hammering as the accepted method.

The above suggestion has been incorporated in the specification under *Structure Assembly*.

k. In the *Structure Assembly* section, there was one comment suggesting a method for installing crossarms, crossbraces, and knee braces. The commentor emphasized that in no case will the owner allow total framing on the ground and the erection of a rigid structure.

These remarks were carefully considered. The intention of this specification is to frame the structures on the ground and then erect the entire structure. No one objected to this procedure, with the exception of the above remark which seems to be opposed primarily to erection of a rigid structure. This construction specification allows the contractor certain freedoms in erecting the structures. In the *Structure Erection* section, the specification does require that care be taken by contractor not to overstress any members or connections when

installing structures. Of course, any structure damaged by the contractor during handling and erection, would be replaced by the contractor. In cases where the structure is to be framed in the air, the *Structure Assembly* section should be modified.

l. Several comments were made concerning backfilling and compaction of the pole holes during the structure erection. A summary of these suggestions follow: (1) The compacted dry density shall not be less than the in place dry density; (2) two mechanical vibrators and one shoveler be used when backfilling; (3) a spare vibrator be maintained in good working order; (4) sufficient water be poured in the hole as backfill is added to maintain a water level 2-3 inches above the material; and (5) three hand tampers and one shoveler be used.

The specification was revised to include 1 and 2 above. Although requiring a spare vibrator is an excellent idea, we feel this is a detail which should be left up to the contractor. Pouring water in a hole as the backfill is added may not always be a good idea. Although the backfill should have an optimum moisture content, too much water can prevent proper compaction.

m. Two people requested that when surplus excavated material is spread at the tower site, the landowner should be contacted and agree to it in writing.

Although common practice in rural areas is to spread surplus soil from the pole holes over the site, it may not be appropriate in some instances. As a result, the specification was changed to indicate "when approved by the engineer."

n. When installing the guys and anchors, there were questions as to how the guys could be pretensioned without the conductors installed.

The wording has been modified to reflect the intention of the specification. The new wording will be "Each guy shall be pretensioned to remove the slack out of the guy strand."

o. The requirement by the specification that requires all anchors to be tested to their ultimate capacity was commented on by several people as being an unusually stringent requirement. One person indicated that they have installed many miles of transmission line without ever testing an anchor in place. In fact, he further mentions that the loads most anchors are subjected never approach their ultimate capacity.

In certain instances cooperatives have tested screw anchor installations and have found indications that their capacity may not reach the anticipated

capacity. As a result, REA felt that testing anchors in some situations may be necessary. The specification was revised to indicate that the anchors are to be tested where required by the engineer. The unit costs for testing of anchors should be requested in the bid costs.

p. In Section VI, Conductors and Overhead Ground Wires, several people made reference to the fact that the specification limits checking of the sag of the conductors to one method: Target and transit. Since the stopwatch method has been used successfully for years, they see no reason to eliminate this method from checking sags.

REA recognizes the use of stopwatch method, but prefers the direct target method. Because there are certain limitations which must be adhered to when using the stopwatch method, the specification has been modified to indicate, "When approved by the engineer, sags may be checked by the return wave method." The limitations when using the stopwatch method can be found in Chapter VII-7, Method for Checking Conductor Sag, of REA Bulletin 160-2, Mechanical Design Manual for Overhead Distribution Lines.

There were numerous comments to the drawings, many of which were editorial in nature. The following is a summary of many of the other comments. The comments have been organized to proceed from general remarks to more specific areas.

q. One of the most reoccurring comments concerning a change in the names of some of the pole top assemblies, insulator assemblies, etc. Several cooperatives indicated that this could cause considerable confusion as all past records, design drawings, plan-profile sheets, etc., have the old REA standard designations. Shifting unit designations may also cause major confusion for maintenance of previously constructed lines as well as for retirement of a previously constructed line. Also some of its cooperatives have designed additional structures for use in design and construction of transmission lines which start with the next number in sequence from where REA had stopped. These have designations which would conflict with some of those in the draft.

In changing some of the designations for the pole top units REA organized the designations in a systematic manner. In most cases where preliminary designations had been changed, they have been changed back to the old system. There is one exception, the pole top assembly for the TH-2A. As a deadend structure it is out of place with a numbering system putting it between

the tangent and small angle structure. Many of the anchors, guy attachments, and guy assemblies were renumbered, but should present no problem. These assemblies can be differentiated from the existing system because the new designation ends in a letter (example TG-10A).

r. Some people wanted the drawing reference number to refer to the same item on all drawings. For example, a $\frac{7}{8}$ " bolt would have a drawing reference of 5 on every pole top assembly drawing.

REA recognizes that the above system has some advantages. If such a system was used, the drawing references might as well be the item designations found in REA Bulletin 43-5, List of Materials Acceptable for Use on Systems of REA Electrification Borrowers. This system is presently used on the distribution drawings. A decision was made to keep the old system of drawing reference numbers.

s. In regard to the List of Materials found on the drawings, two people commented that they wanted the subassemblies to be specified, rather than leaving it up to the user. For instance, in the List of Materials for structure TH-235, item 14 is shown as: "GUY ATTACHMENT _____ DUTY, TG-____D." Why not standardize and show: "GUY ATTACHMENT, MEDIUM DUTY, TG-27D."

One of the main purposes of revising REA Form 805 was to enable the user to tie the selection of the guy attachments to the load and not the voltage. For a 115 kV line using a conductor normally found on a 230 kV line, the user can now specify an appropriate medium or heavy duty guy attachment. REA considered specifying the options presently shown on the drawings, with the user changing the material list as necessary. It was felt, however, that having the engineer fill in the subassembly allows flexibility in his/her choice while at the same time representing different manufacturer's products equally.

t. A question was raised as to why the "horizontal vee" construction was not addressed in this draft. Two or three manufacturers presently have this design available.

REA will include the horizontal vee at some future date, after a standard is developed for the polymer insulator. Use of "horizontal vee" construction either with porcelain or polymer will be continued on a case-by-case basis.

u. Several parties felt that a standard post insulator structure for 115/138 kV without a shield wire should be included in the standard. The structure has been used successfully in several areas.

Early in the project, a decision was made that standard structures 115 kV

and over would have an overhead groundwire. In areas where borrowers do not wish to use an overhead ground wire, the project will be treated on a case-by-case basis. REA basically feels that the use of an overhead ground wire for voltages over 115 kV is prudent even in areas of low isokeraunic levels.

A sampling of comments concerning specific drawings follow:

v. The TP-115, 138 small angle structures, are limited to line angles of 15°. In order to make better use of the structure, the line angle limitation should be based on tension of the conductor.

The horizontal post for these structures has the strength to accommodate larger line angles. The limitation arises from the design of the clamp holding the conductor. The 15° criteria is conservative in limiting wear on the conductors.

w. For the TS-115, 138 structures, a $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $4\frac{1}{2}$ " brace should be considered instead of a $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $5\frac{1}{2}$ " brace. The $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $4\frac{1}{2}$ " is certainly adequate and will save money for the user.

The $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $5\frac{1}{2}$ " brace is presently used for the TH-10 and TH-230 structures. The present standard for the TS/115 structure uses the larger size brace and although there may be some savings, those savings may be offset when a common size brace is used for several structure types.

x. One manufacturer suggested changing the crossarm size of $4\frac{1}{2}$ " x $7\frac{1}{2}$ " used with wishbone construction to $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $7\frac{1}{2}$ ". In order to get the $4\frac{1}{2}$ " x $7\frac{1}{2}$ " size, the arms would have to be cut from the not too common size of $5\frac{1}{2}$ " x $8\frac{1}{2}$ ". To get the $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $7\frac{1}{2}$ ", more common nominal $4\frac{1}{2}$ " x $8\frac{1}{2}$ " could be used.

The suggested change was made and the crossarm size for the wishbone structure is $3\frac{3}{8}$ " x $7\frac{1}{2}$ ".

y. A commenter found that the set of X-braces between the center pole and inside pole actually detracts from the overall strength of the TH-232 structure. The front X-brace assembly should be removed.

When analyzing a similar structure, we had made the same observation. The front brace was removed from the standard drawing.

z. One commenter addressed H-frame structures and the possible use of vee braces. It was noted that there is a problem with the 1'-0" dimension between the mounting bolt of the steel tie bar and the mounting bolt of the vee brace on the pole. For oversized pole tops for class 1 or 2 poles, it is difficult to install the vee brace. In order to install the vee brace, the contractor cannot change the spacer attachment by

moving it further from the pole, he will have to field drill a new hole in the pole above the one specified which may be only 8 inches below that of the tie bar. The raised vee brace presents a conflict in stringing. The dimension available between the bottom of the steel tie-bar and the vee brace is inadequate to prevent most stringing dollies from rubbing on the vee brace. Also with the raised brace installation of a cushioned suspension unit is difficult because of confined working space.

The above suggestion has been carefully considered. The top mounting bolt hole for the vee brace is to be field drilled. Only one hole should be drilled to accommodate the brace to pole connection. The problem with clearance could also be associated with the braces being supplied which may be too long for the TH-10 series. The length of the braces should be designed for a maximum length of 9'-5" which has a 6'-0" drop and a spacing of 7'-3". This length of brace will accommodate a 12-inch diameter pole at the brace location. We have not ruled out increasing the vertical dimension from the top of the pole to the crossarm by 3 inches to 6 inches, but we do question if the manufacturer of the vee brace has designed the standard brace for too long of a length.

aa. A manufacturer commented that the TM-110C should be shown on a separate sheet because of the difference in end fittings. Also, they did not believe a 1" bolt or grid gains were necessary for the TM-110C.

The new TM-110C is the same as the existing TM-110A. We have no basis to change the mounting bolts to 3/8". Theoretically, as the dimension between poles becomes greater, there is more compression and uplift in the poles creating a greater chance that the H-frame will "walk." Use of a 1" bolt instead of a 3/8" bolt helps to maintain the integrity of the crossbrace to pole connection.

ab. In reference to the second sheet of drawing TM-9, Grounding, the drawing shows multipole structures grounded together as well as grounded to anchors. On a three pole deadend structure with 17 anchors this would be a considerable project and many cases impossible if installed in rock. The person further commented that they have never installed ties underground as shown and questions the reasoning for this.

REA is not suggesting that these construction units be installed on every project. These grounding units can be specified if the borrower or consultant feels additional grounding is necessary. Even in the case of a deadend with 17 anchors some but not all the anchors

could be tied in with the pole ground. The number of anchors to be connected to the pole ground is also left to the discretion of the owner or owner's engineer.

ac. There was a request to retain the wood davit arm, as well as the steel davit arm.

REA has no objection to the use of wood davit arm and will consider it on a case-by-case basis. The steel davit arm has been found to be more economical than wood. Drawing TM-115 will standardize on the mounting of the steel arm.

ad. One person pointed out that on the drawing for Power Screw Anchors, note 2 should read, "minimum projection after preloading is 8 inches." Forcing a screw anchor rod past the required torque may weaken it. Leaving it stick out 2 feet is better than to over torque it.

Note 2 of drawing TA-1S to 24S will be revised. We agree with the thinking that over torquing of the screw anchor so that it doesn't project too far may not be prudent. Note 2 will read, "Recommended maximum projection after preloading is 8 inches. Projection may be increased to avoid over torquing of the shaft. Final projection shall be approved by the engineer."

ae. Several comments concerned the TMG drawings. They questioned why the guys are not shown and the guying arrangements are not shown in a plan view.

The particular details concerning guying are to be completed by the engineer before requesting construction bids. In the past, guying drawings were placed on a section of the plan-profile drawings, but many times they were accidentally omitted. By including basic drawings, it is hoped the necessary details are completed. One is to show the slope of the guy, the location and arrangement of anchors, and the right-of-way offset in plan and elevation of the structure. Because of the number of variations, it was not possible for these drawings to be filled in completely.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1736

Electric utilities, Engineering standards, Incorporation by reference.

In view of the above, 7 CFR Part 1736, § 1736.97 is amended by revising the entry for 50-1.

PART 1736—ELECTRIC STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS

1. The authority cited for 7 CFR Part 1736 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*, 7 U.S.C. 1921 *et seq.*

2. The table in § 1736.97(b) is amended by revising the entry for Bulletin 50-1 to read as follows:

§ 1736.97 Incorporation by Reference of Electric Standards and Specifications.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

Bulletin 50-1 (T-805-B), Electric Transmission Specifications and Drawings for 115 kV to 230 kV (10-88)

* * * * *

Date: September 30, 1988.

Jack Van Mark,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 88-23023 Filed 10-5-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-15-M

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

12 CFR Parts 615 and 618

Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; General Provisions

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Farm Credit Administration (FCA) adopts final regulations amending 12 CFR Part 615, Subpart H, and Part 618, Subpart J. The regulations amending Subpart H of Part 615 establish minimum permanent capital standards for Farm Credit System ("System") institutions and require them to adopt capital adequacy plans that enable them to meet such standards. The amendment to Subpart H implements section 301(a) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (1987 Act), Pub. L. 100-233, which directs the FCA to issue regulations under section 4.3(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (1971 Act), 12 U.S.C. 2001 *et seq.*, establishing minimum permanent capital standards, expressed as a ratio of capital to assets, that take into account relative risk factors. The regulation provides for a relative weighting of assets on the basis of risk and establishes a minimum ratio of permanent capital to risk-weighted assets of 7 percent, to be achieved by 1993. The standard is phased in through a series of interim permanent capital standards that are determined by reference to each institution's permanent capital ratio on June 30, 1988. Double counting of capital between related institutions is eliminated by subtracting the investment in another System institution from both the capital and assets of the investing institution before computing the permanent capital ratio. This method of eliminating double