per firm for all 33,301 U.S. firms primarily engaged in providing lawn and garden services (SIC 0782, which includes lawn maintenance businesses) was $222,571, which is well below the SBA's current small entity size standard for such businesses of $5 million in sales.

Fresh fruit retail stores, nurseries, and lawn maintenance companies comprise, on a combined basis, 3,860 (approximately 95 percent) of the total 4,056 entities potentially affected by this interim rule. The operations of those entities are, for the most part, local in nature; they do not typically move regulated articles outside of the State of Florida during the normal course of their business, and consumers do not generally move products purchased from those entities out of the State. The fruit sold by grocery stores and other retail food outlets is generally sold for local consumption. Retail nurseries also market their products for local consumption. Lawn maintenance businesses collect yard debris, but they do not normally transport that debris outside the State for disposal.

The fresh fruit retailers affected by this interim rule will be required to abide by restrictions on the interstate movement of regulated articles. They may be affected by this interim rule because fruit sold within the quarantined areas in retail stores cannot be moved outside of the quarantined areas. However, we expect any direct costs of compliance for fresh fruit retailers to be minimal.

The lawn maintenance companies affected by this interim rule will be required to perform additional sanitation measures when maintaining an area inside the quarantined areas. Lawn maintenance companies will have to clean and disinfect their equipment after grooming an area within the quarantined areas, and they must properly dispose of any clippings from plants or trees within the quarantined areas. These requirements will slightly increase costs for lawn maintenance companies affected by this interim rule.

Commercial citrus growers, processors, packers, and shippers within the quarantined areas will still be able to move their fruit interstate, provided the fruit is treated and not shipped to another citrus-producing State. Growers will have to bear the cost of treatment, but that cost is expected to be minimal. The prohibition on moving the fruit to other citrus-producing States is not expected to negatively affect entities within the quarantined areas because most States do not produce citrus and growers are expected to be able to find a ready market in non-citrus-producing States.

The nurseries and commercial groves affected by this interim rule will be required to undergo periodic inspections. These inspections may be inconvenient, but the inspections will not result in any additional costs for the nurseries or growers because APHIS or the State of Florida will provide the services of the inspector without cost to the nursery or grower.

The alternative to the interim rules was to make no changes in the citrus canker regulations. We rejected this alternative because failure to quarantine portions of Broward, Collier, Dade, and Manatee Counties, FL, could result in great economic losses for domestic citrus producers.

The interim rules contained no new information collection or recordkeeping requirements.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 301

Agricultural commodities, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

PART 301—DOMESTIC QUARANTINE NOTICES

Accordingly, we are adopting as a final rule, without change, two interim rules that amended 7 CFR part 301 and that were published at 61 FR 1519–1521 on January 22, 1996, and 64 FR 4777–4780 on February 1, 1999.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 147a, 150bb, 150dd, 150ee, 150ff, 161, 162, and 164–167; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(c).

Done in Washington, DC, this 13th day of July 1999.

Charles P. Schwalbe,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 99–18438 Filed 7–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Parts 170 and 171

RIN 3150–AG08

Revision of Fee Schedules; 100% Fee Recovery, FY 1999; Correction

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a final rule appearing in the **Federal Register** on June 10, 1999 (64 FR 31448), concerning the licensing, inspection, and annual fees charged to its applicants and licensees in compliance with the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. This action is necessary to correct typographical and printing errors.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 9, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Glenda Jackson, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Telephone 301–415–6057.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

In rule FR Doc. 99–14697 published on June 10, 1999 (64 FR 31448), make the following corrections:

1. On page 31458, in the second column, in the first complete paragraph, in lines 17 and 18, the words ''the NRC reviewer's title'' are removed and replaced with ''a brief description of the work being performed'.

2. On page 31466, in the second column, under 5c(2), in the sixth line, the word ''no'' is removed.

3. On page 31470, in the first column, paragraphs (a)(7)(ii) and (a)(7)(iii) are redesignated as paragraphs (a)(7)(ii)(B) and (a)(7)(ii)(C), respectively, and a new paragraph (a)(7)(ii)(A) is added to read as follows:

§ 170.12 Payment of fees.

(a) * * *

(7) * * *

(ii)(A) In the case of a design which has been approved but not certified and for which no application for certification is pending, if the design is not referenced, or if all costs are not recovered within five years after the date of the preliminary design approval (PDA), or the final design approval (FDA), the applicant shall pay the costs, or remainder of those costs, at that time.

* * * * *

§ 171.15 [Corrected]

4. On page 31475, in the second column, the heading for § 171.15 is corrected to read: ''§ 171.15 Annual Fees: Reactor licenses and independent spent fuel storage licenses.''

§ 171.16 [Corrected]

5. We are correcting the table in § 171.16(d), ''Schedule of Materials Annual Fees and Fees for Government Agencies Licensed by NRC,'' in the following manner:

a. On pages 31477 through 31479, insert ''$'' before each amount listed under the heading ''Annual fees [123].''

b. On page 31477, under 1.B, remove the sentence ''See 10 CFR part 171.15(c),'' and under the heading ''Annual fees [123],'' insert '' [11]N/A.''

c. On page 31479, under 10.A, under the heading ''Annual fees [123],'' the word ''[6]N'' is corrected to read ''[6]N/A.''

d. On page 31479, under 13.B, remove the sentence ''N/A (See 10 CFR Part 171.15(c),'' and under the heading ''Annual fees [123],'' insert ''[11]N/A.''

e. On page 31479, footnote 11 is added to read as follows: ''[11]Annual fees for this category of licenses are assessed under 10 CFR 171.15(c).''

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of July, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jesse L. Funches,

Chief Financial Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–18469 Filed 7–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99–SW–40–AD; Amendment 39–11228; AD 99–13–09]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc (MDHI) Model 369D and E Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This document publishes in the **Federal Register** an amendment adopting Airworthiness Directive (AD) 99–13–09 which was sent previously to all known U.S. owners and operators of MDHI Model 369D and E helicopters by individual letters. This AD requires, prior to further flight, inspecting and replacing, if necessary, a certain four-bladed tail rotor fork (fork) assembly. This AD also requires a repetitive inspection of certain fork assemblies at intervals not to exceed 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) and removing and replacing, if necessary, each unairworthy fork assembly with an airworthy fork assembly before further flight. This amendment is prompted by reports from the manufacturer of the discovery of a discrepant part. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent failure of certain fork assemblies, which could cause loss of a tail rotor blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter.

DATES: Effective August 4, 1999, to all persons except those persons to whom it was made immediately effective by Priority Letter AD 99–13–09, issued on June 16, 1999, which contained the requirements of this amendment.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before September 20, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99–SW–40–AD, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Room 663, Fort Worth, Texas 76137.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John L. Cecil, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, Airframe Branch, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, California 90712, telephone (562) 627–5228, fax (562) 627–5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 16, 1999, the FAA issued Priority Letter AD 99–13–09, applicable to MDHI Model 369D and E helicopters with fork assembly, part number (P/N) 369D21701–2 installed, which requires, prior to further flight, inspecting each fork assembly, P/N 369D21701–2, for the presence of ridges on the arms and, if no ridges are present, conducting a dye-penetrant and visual inspection for cracks. If a crack is found, the fork assembly must be replaced with an airworthy fork assembly that has ridges. This AD also requires a repetitive visual inspection at intervals not to exceed 50 hours TIS of those fork assemblies without ridges that are currently installed but for which the initial visual and dye-penetrant inspection did not uncover a crack and removing and replacing, if necessary, each unairworthy fork assembly with an airworthy fork assembly before further flight. That action was prompted by reports from the manufacturer of the discovery of a discrepant part. During the manufacturing process, an unknown number of certain fork assemblies were incorrectly machined in critical areas after the shot-peening process. The two ridges on each of the arms of the fork assemblies were incorrectly machined off. This condition, if not corrected, could result in failure of certain fork assemblies, which could cause loss of a tail rotor blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter.

Since the unsafe condition described is likely to exist or develop on other MDHI Model 369D and E helicopters of the same type design, the FAA issued Priority Letter AD 99–13–09 to prevent failure of the fork assembly which can result in loss of a tail rotor blade and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter. The AD requires, prior to further flight, inspecting and replacing, if necessary, the fork assembly, P/N 369D21701–21, with an airworthy fork assembly. This AD also requires a repetitive inspection of P/N 369D21701–21 without ridges, at intervals not to exceed 50 hours TIS and removing and replacing, if necessary, each unairworthy fork assembly with an airworthy fork assembly before further flight. The actions are required to be accomplished in the area defined in Figure 1, Sheet 2 of 2 of this AD. The short compliance time involved is required because the previously described critical unsafe condition can adversely affect the structural integrity of the helicopter. Therefore, inspecting and replacing, if necessary, the fork assembly, P/N 369D21701–21, with an airworthy fork assembly is required prior to further flight, and this AD must be issued immediately.

Since it was found that immediate corrective action was required, notice and opportunity for prior public comment thereon were impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and good cause existed to make the AD effective immediately by individual letters issued on June 16, 1999 to all known U.S. owners and operators of MDHI Model 369D and E helicopters. These conditions still exist, and the AD is hereby published in the **Federal Register** as an amendment to section 39.13 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 39.13) to make it effective to all persons.

The FAA estimates that 24 helicopters of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 2 work hours per helicopter to perform the initial inspection and 1 work hour per helicopter for each repetitive inspection. Replacing a fork assembly, if necessary, will take approximately 5 work hours. The average labor rate is $60 per work hour. The manufacturer states that there will be no parts cost since the required parts are covered under the manufacturer's warranty. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $20,880; assuming $2,880 for the initial inspection of the entire fleet, $14,400 for 10 repetitive inspections for the entire fleet, and $3,600 to replace 12 fork assemblies.

Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on this rule. Interested persons are invited to comment on this rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the