

agency must recredit annual leave as follows:

(1) When an employee is reemployed in the Federal service in a position covered by subchapter I of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, the employing agency must recredit an amount of annual leave equal to the days or hours of work (including holidays) remaining between the date of reemployment and the expiration of the lump-sum period.

(2) When an employee is reemployed in the Federal service in a position that is not covered by subchapter I of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, but is covered by a different leave system, the employing agency must recredit to the employee an amount of annual leave representing the days or hours of work (including holidays) remaining between the date of reemployment and the expiration of the lump-sum period, as determined under § 630.501(b) of this chapter. If the unexpired period of leave covers a larger amount of leave than can be recredited under the different leave system, the employee must refund only the amount that represents the leave that can be recredited.

(3) When an employee is reemployed prior to the expiration of the lump-sum leave period, the agency may not recredit to the employee the annual leave restored under 5 U.S.C. 6304(d) that was included in a lump-sum payment. The agency must subtract such restored annual leave from the lump-sum leave period before it determines the amount of annual leave to recredit under paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(b) Any annual leave the agency recredits to the employee under paragraph (a) of this section is subject at the beginning of the next leave year to the maximum annual leave limitation established by 5 U.S.C. 6304(a), (b), (c), or (f), as appropriate, for the position in which the employee is reemployed, except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

(c) If the amount of annual leave to be recredited under paragraph (a) of this section is more than the maximum annual leave limitation for the position in which reemployed, and the employee's former maximum annual leave limitation was established under 5 U.S.C. 6304(a), (b), (c), or (f), as appropriate, the agency must establish the employee's new maximum annual leave limitation on the date of reemployment as a personal leave ceiling equal to the amount of annual leave to be recredited under paragraph (a) of this section. The new maximum annual leave limitation is subject to reduction in the same manner as

provided in 5 U.S.C. 6304(c) until the employee's accumulated annual leave is equal to or less than the maximum annual leave limitation for the position in which reemployed.

(d) If the amount of annual leave to be recredited under paragraph (a) of this section is more than the maximum annual leave limitation for the position in which the employee is reemployed, and the employee's former maximum annual leave limitation was established under an authority other than 5 U.S.C. 6304(a), (b), (c), or (f), as appropriate, the agency must establish the employee's new maximum annual leave limitation on the date of reemployment as a personal leave ceiling equal to the employee's former maximum annual leave limitation. The new maximum annual leave limitation is subject to reduction in the same manner as provided in 5 U.S.C. 6304(c) until the employee's accumulated annual leave is equal to or less than the maximum annual leave limitation for the position in which reemployed.

(e) When an employee is reemployed in a position listed in 5 U.S.C. 6301(2)(x)-(xiii), the agency must recredit and hold in abeyance the amount of annual leave that would have been recredited under paragraph (a) of this section. The agency must include unused annual leave in a lump-sum payment when the employee becomes eligible for a lump-sum payment under § 550.1203. If the employee transfers from a position listed in 5 U.S.C. 6301(2)(x)-(xiii) to a position covered by subchapter I of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, or to a position under a different formal leave system to which his or her annual leave can be recredited, the employing agency must recredit the annual leave to the employee's credit as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

(f) An agency must document the calculation of an employee's lump-sum payment as provided in § 550.1205(b) so as to permit the subsequent calculation of any refund required under § 550.1206(a) and any recredit of annual leave required under this section.

#### **PART 591—ALLOWANCES AND DIFFERENTIALS**

8. The authority citation for subpart B of part 591 continues to read as follows:

##### **Subpart B—Cost-of-Living Allowance and Post Differential-Nonforeign Areas**

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 5941; E.O. 10000, 3 CFR, 1943-1948 Comp., p. 792; and E.O. 12510, 3 CFR, 1985 Comp., 338.

#### **§ 591.210 [Amended]**

9. In § 591.210, the last sentence of paragraph (c)(1) is removed.

[FR Doc. 99-16992 Filed 7-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

### **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

#### **Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service**

#### **9 CFR Part 78**

[Docket No. 99-051-1]

#### **Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Kansas**

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Interim rule and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** We are amending the brucellosis regulations concerning the interstate movement of cattle by changing the classification of Kansas from Class A to Class Free. We have determined that Kansas meets the standards for Class Free status. This action relieves certain restrictions on the interstate movement of cattle from Kansas.

**DATES:** This interim rule was effective July 1, 1999. We invite you to comment on this docket. We will consider all comments that we receive by September 7, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send your comment and three copies to: Docket No. 99-051-1, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Suite 3C03, 4700 River Road, Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238.

Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. 99-051-1.

You may read any comments that we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690-2817 before coming.

APHIS documents published in the **Federal Register**, and related information, including the names of organizations and individuals who have commented on APHIS rules, are available on the Internet at <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/rad/webrepor.html>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Valerie Ragan, Senior Staff Veterinarian, National Animal Health Programs, VS,

APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 43, Riverdale, MD 20737-1231; (301) 734-7708; or e-mail:

Valerie.E.Ragan@usda.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

Brucellosis is a contagious disease affecting animals and humans, caused by bacteria of the genus *Brucella*.

The brucellosis regulations, contained in 9 CFR part 78 (referred to below as the regulations), provide a system for classifying States or portions of States according to the rate of *Brucella* infection present and the general effectiveness of a brucellosis control and eradication program. The classifications are Class Free, Class A, Class B, and Class C. States or areas that do not meet the minimum standards for Class C are required to be placed under Federal quarantine.

The brucellosis Class Free classification is based on a finding of no known brucellosis in cattle for the 12 months preceding classification as Class Free. The Class C classification is for States or areas with the highest rate of brucellosis. Class B and Class A fall between these two extremes. Restrictions on moving cattle interstate become less stringent as a State approaches or achieves Class Free status.

The standards for the different classifications of States or areas entail (1) maintaining a cattle herd infection rate not to exceed a stated level during 12 consecutive months; (2) tracing back to the farm of origin and successfully closing a stated percent of all brucellosis reactor cases found in the course of Market Cattle Identification (MCI) testing; (3) maintaining a surveillance system that includes testing of dairy herds, participation of all recognized slaughtering establishments in the MCI program, identification and monitoring of herds at high risk of infection (including herds adjacent to infected herds and herds from which infected animals have been sold or received), and having an individual herd plan in effect within a stated number of days after the herd owner is notified of the finding of brucellosis in a herd he or she owns; and (4) maintaining minimum procedural standards for administering the program.

Before the effective date of this interim rule, Kansas was classified as a Class A State.

To attain and maintain Class Free status, a State or area must (1) remain free from field strain *Brucella abortus* infection for 12 consecutive months or longer; (2) trace back at least 90 percent of all brucellosis reactors found in the

course of MCI testing to the farm of origin; (3) successfully close at least 95 percent of the MCI reactor cases traced to the farm of origin during the 12 consecutive month period immediately prior to the most recent anniversary of the date the State or area was classified Class Free; and (4) have a specified surveillance system, as described above, including an approved individual herd plan in effect within 15 days of locating the source herd or recipient herd.

After reviewing the brucellosis program records for Kansas, we have concluded that this State meets the standards for Class Free status. Therefore, we are removing Kansas from the list of Class A States in § 78.41(b) and adding it to the list of Class Free States in § 78.41(a). This action relieves certain restrictions on moving cattle interstate from Kansas.

**Immediate Action**

The Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that there is good cause for publishing this interim rule without prior opportunity for public comment. Immediate action is warranted to remove unnecessary restrictions on the interstate movement of cattle from Kansas.

Because prior notice and other public procedures with respect to this action are impracticable and contrary to the public interest under these conditions, we find good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553 to make this action effective upon signature. We will consider comments that are received within 60 days of publication of this rule in the **Federal Register**. After the comment period closes, we will publish another document in the **Federal Register**. The document will include a discussion of any comments we receive and any amendments we are making to the rule as a result of the comments.

**Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act**

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review process required by Executive Order 12866.

Cattle moved interstate are moved for slaughter, for use as breeding stock, or for feeding. Changing the brucellosis status of Kansas from Class A to Class Free will promote economic growth by reducing certain testing and other requirements governing the interstate movement of cattle from this State. Testing requirements for cattle moved interstate for immediate slaughter or to quarantined feedlots are not affected by this change. Cattle from certified

brucellosis-free herds moving interstate are not affected by this change.

The groups affected by this action will be herd owners in Kansas, as well as buyers and importers of cattle from this State.

There are an estimated 37,000 cattle herds in Kansas that will be affected by this rule. About 98 percent of these are owned by small entities. Test-eligible cattle offered for sale interstate from other than certified-free herds must have a negative test under present Class A status regulations, but not under regulations concerning Class Free status. If such testing were distributed equally among all animals affected by this rule, Class Free status would save approximately \$4 per head.

Therefore, we believe that changing the brucellosis status of Kansas will not have a significant economic effect on the small entities affected by this interim rule.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

**Executive Order 12372**

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

**Executive Order 12988**

This interim rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are in conflict with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

**Paperwork Reduction Act**

This interim rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

**List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 78**

Animal diseases, Bison, Cattle, Hogs, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR part 78 as follows:

**PART 78—BRUCELLOSIS**

1. The authority citation for part 78 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 111-114a-1, 114g, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123-126, 134b, and 134f; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

**§ 78.41 [Amended]**

2. In § 78.41, paragraph (a) is amended by adding "Kansas," immediately after "Iowa,".

3. In § 78.41, paragraph (b) is amended by removing "Kansas,".

Done in Washington, DC, this 1st day of July 1999.

**Craig A. Reed,**

*Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 99-17357 Filed 7-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 99-NE-35-AD; Amendment 39-11216; AD 99-14-06]

RIN 2120-AA64

**Airworthiness Directives; MT-Propeller Entwicklung GMBH Models MTV-9-B-C and MTV-3-B-C Propellers**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to MT-Propeller Entwicklung GMBH Models MTV-9-B-C and MTV-3-B-C propellers. This action requires initial and repetitive inspections of Torx head blade root lag screws for torque values and breakage, and, if any screws are found broken or with insufficient torque, replacement of all screws with new lag screws. In addition, this AD requires replacement of certain model Torx head blade root lag screws with improved, hexagonal head blade root lag screws. This amendment is prompted by reports of broken Torx head blade root lag screws. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent blade root lag screw breakage, which could result in propeller blade separation and loss of control of the airplane.

**DATES:** Effective July 23, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of July 23, 1999.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before September 7, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation

Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-NE-35-AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803-5299. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: "9-ane-adcomment@faa.gov". Comments sent via the Internet must contain the docket number in the subject line.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from MT-Propeller Entwicklung GMBH, Airport Straubing-Wallmuhle, D-94348 Atting, Germany; telephone (0 94 29) 84 33, fax (0 94 29) 84 32, Internet: "propeller@aol.com". This information may be examined at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, suite 700, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Wayne E. Gaulzetti, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803-5299; telephone (781) 238-7156, fax (781) 238-7199.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA), which is the airworthiness authority for Germany, recently notified the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that an unsafe condition may exist on MT-Propeller Entwicklung GMBH Models MTV-9-B-C and MTV-3-B-C propellers. The LBA advises that they have received reports of broken Torx head blade root lag screws found during routine teardowns. The investigation revealed that the screws broke due to insufficient torque. This condition, if not corrected, could result in blade root lag screw breakage, which could result in propeller blade separation and loss of control of the airplane.

MT-Propeller Entwicklung GMBH has issued Service Bulletin (SB) No. 17-A, dated March 5, 1999, that specifies procedures for inspections for Torx head blade root lag screws for torque values and breakage, and replacement of Torx head blade root lag screws, part number (P/N) A-550-85 (4mm thread pitch), with improved, hexagonal head blade root lag screws, P/N A-983-85. The LBA classified this SB as mandatory and issued airworthiness directives (ADs) 1999-081/2 and 1999-082/2 in order to assure the airworthiness of these propellers in Germany.

This propeller model is manufactured in Germany and is 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 LBA has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the LBA, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other propellers of the same type design registered in the United States, the AD requires initial and repetitive inspections of Torx head blade root lag screws for torque values and breakage, and, if any screws are found with insufficient torque or are broken, replacement of all screws with new lag screws. In addition, this AD requires replacement of Torx head blade root lag screws, P/N A-550-85 (4mm thread pitch), with improved, hexagonal head blade root lag screws, P/N A-983-85. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the SB described previously.

Since a situation exists that requires the immediate adoption of this regulation, it is found that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

**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 Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES**. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered, and this rule may be amended in light of the comments received. Factual information that supports the commenter's ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the AD action and determining whether additional rulemaking action would be needed.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify the rule. All comments