

**PART 457—COMMON CROP  
INSURANCE REGULATIONS;  
REGULATIONS FOR THE 1998 AND  
SUBSEQUENT CONTRACT YEARS**

1. The authority citation for part 457 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 1506(l), 1506(p).

**§ 457.128 [Corrected]**

2. In § 457.128, paragraph 10(b)(7) is further corrected to read as follows: "October 31 of the crop year in California, November 10 of the crop year in Florida and Georgia, and September 20 of the crop year in all other states."

Signed in Washington D.C., on June 26, 1998.

**Joy Harwood,**

*Acting Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 98-17636 Filed 7-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-08-P

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**Federal Crop Insurance Corporation**

**7 CFR Part 457**

**Dry Pea; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, USDA.

**ACTION:** Correcting amendment.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains corrections to the final regulation which was published in the **Federal Register** on Tuesday, December 16, 1997 (62 FR 65741-65747). The regulation pertains to the Dry Pea Crop Insurance Provisions.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 1, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Arden Routh, Insurance Management Specialist, Research and Development, Product Development Division, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, United States Department of Agriculture, 9435 Holmes Road, Kansas City, MO 64131, telephone (816) 926-7730.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

The final regulation that is the subject of this correction was intended to provide policy changes to better meet the needs of the insured and include the pea crop insurance regulations with the Common Crop Insurance Policy for ease of use and consistency of terms.

**Need for Correction**

As published, the final regulation contained an error which may prove misleading. The local market price definition was based on the cash price

per pound for U.S. No. 2 grade of dry peas and is being corrected to be based on the cash price per pound for U.S. No. 1 grade of dry peas. Dry Pea production that is eligible for quality adjustment is based on production grading U.S. No. 2 or worse; therefore, any production not grading U.S. No. 1 is eligible for quality adjustment. The local market price must be based on the U.S. No. 1 grade rather than U.S. No. 2. The value of the damaged or conditioned production is divided by the local market price (based on U.S. No. 1 grade) to calculate the quality adjustment factor under section 12(e) of the crop provisions.

**List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 457**

Crop insurance, Dry pea.

Accordingly, 7 CFR part 457 is corrected by making the following correcting amendment:

**PART 457—COMMON CROP  
INSURANCE REGULATIONS;  
REGULATIONS FOR THE 1998 AND  
SUBSEQUENT CONTRACT YEARS**

1. The authority citation for part 457 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 1506(l), 1506(p).

**§ 457.140 [Corrected]**

2. In § 457.140, section 1 of the policy pertaining to the definition of "Local market price" is corrected by removing the phrase "U.S. No. 2", in the first and second sentences, and replacing it with "U.S. No. 1".

Signed in Washington D.C., on June 26, 1998.

**Joy Harwood,**

*Acting Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 98-17637 Filed 7-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-08-P

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**Rural Housing Service**

**Rural Business-Cooperative Service**

**Rural Utilities Service**

**Farm Service Agency**

**7 CFR Part 1980**

**RIN 0560-AE92**

**Subordination of Direct Loan Basic  
Security To Secure a Guaranteed Line  
of Credit; Correction**

**AGENCIES:** Rural Housing Service, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Utilities Service, Farm Service Agency, USDA.

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects the amendatory language contained in the final rule published April 24, 1998, regarding approving a subordination of direct loan security when another lender will be making a line of credit guaranteed by the Agency with a Contract of Guarantee-Line of Credit. This correction clarifies that the conditions applicable to a subordination of direct loan basic security do not apply to the subordination of direct loan normal income security. This correction will apply retroactively to those lines of credit approved since the effective date of the final rule.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 26, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Phillip Elder (202) 690-4012; Electronic mail: pelder@wdc.fsa.usda.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

The final rule being corrected by this publication was intended to allow subordination of direct loan basic chattel and real estate security to secure a guaranteed line of credit in certain cases, to allow subordinations for refinancing purposes and to remove a loan maximum limitation that had been repealed.

**Need for Correction**

As published, the final rule had the unintentional effect of greatly increasing the conditions that must be met for the Agencies to subordinate direct loan normal income security when making a guaranteed line of credit. These extra conditions were intended to apply only to subordinations of basic security when making a guaranteed line of credit. As stated in the final rule discussion of the fourth comment received, "Regardless, the limitations included in § 1980.108(a) will allow subordinations of direct loan basic security in only those cases where the likelihood of a Government loss on the direct loan is small." The extra conditions were not to be applied to subordinations of normal income security. The definitions of normal income and basic security are contained in § 1962.4 of Title 7. Also, as part of this correction, the first extra condition in § 1980.108(a)(1)(vi) is clarified to more clearly state that the required loan to value ratio is to be calculated based on all of the borrower's direct loans and all of the loan security and is not calculated on a single loan basis for multiple loan borrowers.

**Correction of Publication**

In the final rule published in **Federal Register**, 63 FR 20295-20299, on April 24, 1998, make the following corrections in the amendatory language section: At

63 FR 20298, in the third column, § 1980.108, introductory paragraph (a)(1)(vi) and the first sentence of paragraph (a)(1)(vi)(A), should be corrected to read as follows:

**§ 1980.108 General provisions.**

- (a) \* \* \*  
(1) \* \* \*

(vi) The Agency may subordinate direct loan basic security under paragraph (a)(1)(v)(D) of this section only when both of the following additional conditions are met:

(A) The total unpaid principal and interest balance of all of the borrower's direct loans secured by the property being subordinated is less than or equal to 75 percent of the value of all of the basic security for the direct loan, excluding the value of growing crops or planned production, on the date the Agency approves the subordination.  
\* \* \*

Signed at Washington, DC, on June 22, 1998.

**August Schumacher Jr.,**

*Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.*

Dated: June 10, 1998.

**Jill Long Thompson,**

*Under Secretary for Rural Development.*

[FR Doc. 98-17562 Filed 7-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-05-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-10642; AD 98-14-09]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### **Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C Series Airplanes**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Boeing Model 737-100, -200, and -200C series airplanes. This action requires repetitive inspections to detect fatigue cracking and certain discrepancies of the forward engine mount support (FEMS) fitting and its attachments, and repair, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by reports of fatigue cracks on the lower flange of the FEMS fitting, broken bolts and bolts with loose or detached nuts on the upper inboard attachment of the

FEMS fitting, and cracked or severed lugs at the outboard support link attachment of the FEMS fitting. The actions specified in this AD are intended to detect and correct fatigue cracking and certain discrepancies of the FEMS fitting and its attachments, which could result in an in-flight separation of an engine.

**DATES:** Effective July 17, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of July 17, 1998.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before August 31, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-121-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124-2207. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Gregory L. Schneider, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-2028; fax (425) 227-1181.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA has received reports of certain problems affecting the forward engine mount support (FEMS) fitting on certain Boeing Model 737 series airplanes. This support fitting is one of the primary structural elements that attach the engine to the wing. The reports indicate that three critical elements of the FEMS fitting have proved to be susceptible to fatigue damage or other problems as summarized below:

- Lower Flange of the FEMS Fitting:

The FAA has received 17 reports of cracks of the lower flange "I" section of the FEMS fitting. Analysis indicates that the cracks were initiated by fatigue. A FEMS fitting that has a cracked lower flange may not be capable of withstanding certain limit load conditions.

- Upper Inboard Attachment Bolt:

There have been 13 cases of the upper inboard attachment bolt fracturing in service due to fatigue, and 4 cases of the

nut being broken, loose, or detached. Investigation revealed that the original production bolt installation was subject to relative motion between the bushing and the attachment bolt. As a result, the production nut (which has no secondary locking features) tended to come loose in service. A later configuration change that was intended to correct this problem consisted of installing a stronger bolt and nut, and a new bushing. This change, which has subsequently been adopted by almost the entire fleet of affected airplanes, requires the nut to be torqued to a higher value than is appropriate for the bolt and nut installation. Specifically, the torque applied to the new nut is applicable to a "non-lubricated" thread condition, whereas the nut material tends to act as a "dry" lubricant. Consequently, the higher torque applied to the new bolt and nut configuration induces an excessive pre-load on the bolt threads. This excessive pre-load, in conjunction with certain operational loads, causes an overload condition on the bolt threads, which in turn leads to premature fatigue cracking of the bolt. Additionally, results of an analysis indicate that the FEMS fitting cannot react certain limit load conditions with a fractured or detached bolt at this location.

- Upper Outboard Lug of the FEMS Fitting:

The upper outboard lug of the FEMS fitting contains a bearing that has proved susceptible to excessive wearing. This lug is designed to secure the outboard end of the FEMS fitting to the wing. A severely worn bearing could drastically reduce the fatigue life of the lug. This condition has been observed on six airplanes to date; on three of those airplanes the lug was found to be completely fractured. Analysis has revealed that the FEMS fitting cannot react certain limit load conditions with a severed lug.

#### **Explanation of the Unsafe Condition**

The fatigue cracking problems that affect the three areas of the FEMS fitting are examples of "multiple element damage." The existence of any one of these conditions could result in an engine separation under certain limit load conditions. The simultaneous existence of any two conditions could result in an immediate engine loss at loads that are much lower than the design limit loads. These problems, if not corrected, could result in an in-flight separation of an engine.