

marketing and promotion programs. Prior to arriving at this budget, the Committee considered alternative expenditure levels, including a proposal to not have a budget. The assessment rate of \$0.75 per hundredweight of assessable dates was then determined by applying the following formula where:

A = Administrative Reserve (\$30,365 of the anticipated \$40,000 Administrative Reserve)

B = 2003–04 expected shipments (260,000 hundredweight)

C = 2003–04 expenses (\$225,365);
(C – A) ÷ B = \$0.75 per hundredweight.

Estimated shipments should provide \$195,000 in assessment income. Income derived from handler assessments and the administrative reserves will be adequate to cover budgeted expenses. Funds in the administrative reserve on September 30, 2004, are expected to be less than the maximum permitted by the order (not to exceed 50 percent of the average of expenses incurred during the most recent five preceding crop years; § 987.72(c)).

A review of historical information and preliminary information pertaining to the upcoming crop year indicates that the grower price for the 2003–04 season could range between \$40 and \$120 per hundredweight of dates. Therefore, the estimated assessment revenue for the 2003–04 crop year as a percentage of total grower revenue could range between .6 and 2 percent.

This action decreases the assessment obligation imposed on handlers under the Federal marketing order.

Assessments are applied uniformly on all handlers, and some of the costs may be passed on to producers. However, decreasing the assessment rate reduces the burden on handlers, and may reduce the burden on producers. In addition, the Committee's meeting was widely publicized throughout the California date industry, and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Committee deliberations on all issues. Like all Committee meetings, the June 20, 2003, meeting was a public meeting and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue.

This rule imposes no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large California date handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies.

USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

A proposed rule concerning this action was published in the **Federal Register** on July 28, 2003 (68 FR 44241). Copies of the proposed rule were also mailed or sent via facsimile to all date handlers. Finally, the proposal was made available through the Internet by the Office of the Federal Register and USDA. A 30-day comment period ending August 27, 2003, was provided for 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.

After consideration of all relevant material 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.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it also found and determined that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because handlers will soon be receiving 2003–04 crop dates from growers. In addition, the crop year begins on October 1, 2003, and the assessment rate applies to all assessable dates during the 2003–04 and subsequent seasons. Further, handlers are aware of this rule which was recommended at a public meeting. Also, a 30-day comment period was provided for in the proposed rule and no comments were received.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 987

Dates, Marketing agreements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 987 is amended 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: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. Section 987.339 is revised to read as follows:

§ 987.339 Assessment rate.

On and after October 1, 2003, an assessment rate of \$0.75 per hundredweight is established for California dates.

Dated: September 23, 2003.

A.J. Yates,
Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 03–24539 Filed 9–26–03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2003–NE–20–AD; Amendment 39–13242; AD 2003–14–23]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211–524G2, –524G2–T, –524G3, –524G3–T, –524H, –524H–T, –524H2, and “524H2–T Series, and Models RB211 Trent 768–60, 772–60, and 772B–60 Turbofan Engines; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document makes a correction to Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2003–14–23 applicable to Rolls-Royce plc RB211–524G2, –524G2–T, –524G3, –524G3–T, –524H, –524H–T, –524H2, and “524H2–T Series, and Models RB211 Trent 768–60, 772–60, and 772B–60 turbofan engines that was published in the **Federal Register** on July 17, 2003. RB211 Trent 768–60, 772–60, and 772B–60 turbofan engine models were included in this AD in error. This document deletes these models from the AD. In all other respects, the original document remains the same.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Effective September 29, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Antonio Cancelliere, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (781) 238–7751; fax (781) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A final rule AD, FR Doc. 03–18078, applicable to Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211–524G2, –524G2–T, –524G3, –524G3–T, –524H, –524H–T, –524H2, and –524H2–T series, and models RB211 Trent 768–60, 772–60, and 772B–60 turbofan engines, was published in the **Federal Register** on July 17, 2003 (68 FR 42242). The following correction is needed:

■ 1. On page 42242, in the second column, the Subject Heading, “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211–524G2, –524G2–T, –524G3,

—524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and “524H2—T Series, and Models RB211 Trent 768—60, 772—60, and 772B—60 Turbofan Engines” is corrected to read “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and “524H2—T Series Turbofan Engines”.

■ 2. In the second column of page 42242, the first sentence of the Summary, “The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and —524H2—T series, and models RB211 Trent 768—60, 772—60, and 772B—60 turbofan engines with high pressure compressor (HPC) rotor stage 1 through stage 6 drums, part numbers (P/Ns) FK25502 and FW20195 installed.” is corrected to read “The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and —524H2—T series turbofan engines with high pressure compressor (HPC) rotor stage 1 through stage 6 drums, part numbers (P/Ns) FK25502 and FW20195 installed.”

■ 3. In the third column of page 42242, the first sentence of the Supplementary Information, “The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is the airworthiness authority for the U.K., recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on RR RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and —524H2—T series, and models RB211 Trent 768—60, —772—60, and 772B—60 turbofan engines with HPC stage 1 through stage 6 drums, P/Ns FK25502 and FW20195 installed.” is corrected to read “The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is the airworthiness authority for the U.K., recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on RR RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and 524H2—T series turbofan engines with HPC stage 1 through stage 6 drums, P/Ns FK25502 and FW20195 installed.”

■ 4. In the first column of page 42243, the second sentence under FAA’s Determination and Requirements of This AD “Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other Rolls-Royce plc RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and —524H2—T series, and models RB211 Trent 768—60, 772—60, and 772B—60 turbofan engines of this same type design” is corrected to read “Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other Rolls-Royce plc RB211—524G2, —524G2—

T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and “524H2—T series turbofan engines of this same type design.”

§ 39.13 [Corrected]

■ 5. On page 42243, in the third column, the first sentence in paragraph (c) is corrected to read as follows:

(c) This AD applies to Rolls-Royce plc RB211—524G2, —524G2—T, —524G3, —524G3—T, —524H, —524H—T, —524H2, and —524H2—T series turbofan engines with high pressure compressor (HPC) rotor stage 1 through stage 6 drums, part numbers (P/Ns) FK25502 and FW20195 installed. * * *

Issued in Burlington, MA, on September 19, 2003.

Francis A. Favara,

Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03—24374 Filed 9—26—03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910—13—P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000—NM—408—AD; Amendment 39—13314; AD 2003—19—11]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 60 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Learjet Model 60 airplanes, that currently requires inspection to detect bends in or damage to the fuel crossflow tube; inspection to determine clearance between the fuel crossflow tube and the flight control cables; and replacement or repair of the tube, if necessary. This amendment requires a review of airplane maintenance records or an inspection to determine if a fuel crossflow tube having a certain part number is installed; and follow-on/corrective actions, as applicable. This amendment also expands the applicability of the existing AD to include additional airplanes. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent chafing and consequent failure of the fuel crossflow tube due to inadequate clearance between the tube and the flight control cables, which could result in loss of fuel from one fuel tank during normal operating conditions or loss of fuel from both main fuel tanks during fuel cross-

feeding operations. This action is intended to address the identified unsafe condition.

DATES: Effective November 3, 2003.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of November 3, 2003.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Learjet, Inc., One Learjet Way, Wichita, Kansas 67209—2942. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jeffrey Janusz, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Propulsion Branch, ACE—116W, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946—4148; fax (316) 946—4407.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) by superseding AD 95—14—09, amendment 39—9303 (60 FR 36984, July 19, 1995), which is applicable to certain Learjet Model 60 airplanes, was published in the **Federal Register** on June 18, 2003 (68 FR 36502). That action proposed to require inspection to detect bends in or damage to the fuel crossflow tube; inspection to determine clearance between the fuel crossflow tube and the flight control cables; and replacement or repair of the tube, if necessary. That action also proposed to require a review of airplane maintenance records or an inspection to determine if a fuel crossflow tube having a certain part number is installed; and follow-on/corrective actions, as applicable. That action also proposed to expand the applicability of the existing AD to include additional airplanes.

Comments

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were submitted in response to the proposal or the FAA’s determination of the cost to the public.