

Without any regulations in effect, the Committee believes the industry would return to the pronounced cyclical price patterns that occurred prior to the order, and that prices in 2003–2004 would decline substantially below current levels.

As stated earlier, the Committee believes that the order has contributed extensively to the stabilization of producer prices, which prior to 1980 experienced wide fluctuations from year-to-year. National Agricultural Statistics Service records show that the average price paid for both classes of spearmint oil ranged from about \$4.00 per pound to about \$12.50 per pound during the period between 1968 and 1980. Prices have been consistently more stable since the marketing order's inception in 1980. For much of the 1990's, prices had stabilized at about \$13.00 per pound for Scotch spearmint oil and about \$11.00 per pound for Native spearmint oil.

Over the last four years, however, large production and carry-in inventories have contributed to declining prices, despite the Committee's efforts to balance available supplies with demand. Further, over the same period, prices have ranged from \$8.00 to \$11.00 per pound for Scotch spearmint oil and between \$9.00 to \$10.00 per pound for Native spearmint oil.

According to the Committee, the recommended salable quantities and allotment percentages are expected to achieve the goals of market and price stability.

As previously stated, annual salable quantities and allotment percentages have been issued for both classes of spearmint oil since the order's inception. Reporting and recordkeeping requirements have remained the same for each year of regulation. These requirements have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget under OMB Control No. 0581–0065.

Accordingly, this action will not impose any additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large spearmint oil producers and handlers. All reports and forms associated with this program are reviewed periodically in order to avoid unnecessary and duplicative information collection by industry and public sector agencies. The USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

The Committee's meeting was widely publicized throughout the spearmint oil industry and all interested persons were invited to attend and participate on all issues. In addition, interested persons

are invited to submit information on the regulatory and informational impacts of this action on small businesses.

A proposed rule concerning this action was published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 2003 (68 FR 11751). Copies of the rule were provided to Committee staff, which in turn made it available to spearmint oil producers, handlers, and other interested persons. Finally, the rule was made available through the Internet by the Office of the Federal Register and USDA. A 20-day comment period ending April 1, 2003, was provided to allow interested persons to respond to the proposal. No comments were received.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: <http://www.ams.usda.gov/fv/moab.html>. Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Jay Guerber at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

It is further found that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** (5 U.S.C. 553) because the 2003–2004 marketing year begins on June 1, 2003. Further, handlers are aware of this rule, which was recommended at a public meeting. Also, a 20-day comment period was provided for in the proposed rule and no comments were received.

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

#### List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 985

Marketing agreements, Oils and fats, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Spearmint oil.

■ For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 985 is amended as follows:

#### **PART 985—MARKETING ORDER REGULATING THE HANDLING OF SPEARMINT OIL PRODUCED IN THE FAR WEST**

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 985 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. A new § 985.222 is added to read as follows:

(**Note:** This section will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.)

#### **§ 985.222 Salable quantities and allotment percentages—2003–2004 marketing year.**

The salable quantity and allotment percentage for each class of spearmint oil during the marketing year beginning on June 1, 2003, shall be as follows:

(a) Class 1 (Scotch) oil—a salable quantity of 857,444 pounds and an allotment percentage of 45 percent.

(b) Class 3 (Native) oil—a salable quantity of 808,528 pounds and an allotment percentage of 38 percent.

Dated: April 29, 2003.

**Kenneth C. Clayton,**

*Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[FR Doc. 03–11026 Filed 5–2–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–02–P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **10 CFR Parts 70, 71, and 73**

**RIN 3150–AH09**

#### **Filing and Notification Requirements for the Shipments of Certain Radioactive Materials**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a final rule appearing in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2003 (68 FR 14528), that revised filing and advance notification requirements for the shipments of certain radioactive materials. This action corrects erroneous references to the organizational listing, “Director, Division of Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.”

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 26, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kim Karcagi, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–6701, e-mail: [kxk2@nrc.gov](mailto:kxk2@nrc.gov), or Philip Brochman, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–6557, e-mail: [PGB@nrc.gov](mailto:PGB@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The NRC published a final rule in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2003 (68 FR 14528). This document is necessary to correct the references, “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security, to “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.” The erroneous references appear in each part and

various sections of the March 26, 2003, final rule.

**§ 70.20b [Corrected]**

■ 1. In § 70.20b(f)(1), (f)(2)(ii), (f)(2)(iii), and (g)(1), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security,” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response”.

**§ 71.97 [Corrected]**

■ 2. In § 71.97(c)(1) and (f)(1), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response”.

**§ 73.26 [Corrected]**

■ 3. In § 73.26(i)(6), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.”

**§ 73.27 [Corrected]**

■ 4. In § 73.27(b), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response” wherever they appear.

**§ 73.67 [Corrected]**

■ 5. In § 73.67(e)(7)(ii), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.”

**§ 73.71 [Corrected]**

■ 6. In § 73.71(a)(4), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response”.

**§ 73.72 [Corrected]**

■ 7. In § 73.72(a), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security,” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response” wherever they appear.

**§ 73.73 [Corrected]**

■ 8. In § 73.73(a)(1) and (b), the words, “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security,” are corrected to read

“Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response”.

**§ 73.74 [Corrected]**

■ 9. In § 73.74(a)(1) and (b), the words “Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Division of Nuclear Security” are corrected to read “Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response”.

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of April, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Michael T. Lesar,**

*Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03-10860 Filed 5-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

---

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 2003-CE-18-AD; Amendment 39-13139; AD 2003-09-10]

RIN 2120-AA64

**Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 Airplanes**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to certain Raytheon Aircraft Company (Raytheon) Model 390 airplanes. This AD requires you to modify the aft power distribution box and the aft ram air duct. This AD is the result of reports of two incidents involving temporary loss of all attitude display information. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent moisture from entering the aft power distribution box through the aft ram air duct, which could result in electrical power failure. Such failure could lead to loss of all attitude display information during flight.

**DATES:** This AD becomes effective on May 13, 2003.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulation as of May 13, 2003.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must receive any comments on this rule on or before June 20, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments to FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional

Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003-CE-18-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. You may view any comments at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also send comments electronically to the following address: 9-ACE-7-Docket@faa.gov. Comments sent electronically must contain “Docket No. 2003-CE-18-AD” in the subject line. If you send comments electronically as attached electronic files, the files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

You may get the service information referenced in this AD from Raytheon Aircraft Company, 9709 E. Central, Wichita, Kansas 67201-0085; telephone: (800) 429-5372 or (316) 676-3140. You may view this information at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003-CE-18-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bryan Easterwood, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946-4132; facsimile: (316) 946-4107.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Discussion**

*What events have caused this AD?* The FAA has received reports of two incidents involving temporary loss of all attitude display information during flight on certain Raytheon Model 390 airplanes. Through investigation and testing, we discovered that moisture is entering the aft power distribution box through the aft ram air duct, which could freeze and/or cause corrosion to form in the left-hand and right-hand generator relays, battery tie relay, and the essential bus relay. This condition could cause the relays to fail in the open position or fail in the mid position and result in loss of power.

Raytheon issued Safety Communiqué No. 222, dated April 2002, to inform the owners/operators that power to the standby electrical bus can be restored by placing the Battery switch in the STBY position to allow continued flight and landing.

*What are the consequences if the condition is not corrected?* This condition, if not corrected, could result in electrical power failure. Such failure could lead to loss of all attitude display information during flight.

*Is there service information that applies to this subject?* Raytheon has