request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alternation, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent critical life-limited rotating engine part failure, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Within the next 30 days after the effective date of this AD, revise the Time Limit Section (TLS) of the PW JT8D–200 Engine Manual (EM), Part Number 773128, and for air carrier operations revise the approved continuous airworthiness maintenance program, by adding the following:

''3. Critical Life Limited Part Inspection

A. Inspection Requirements

(1) This section has the definitions for individual engine piece-parts and the inspection procedures which are necessary when these parts are removed from the engine.

(2) It is necessary to do the inspection procedures of the piece-parts in Paragraph B when:

(a) The part is removed from the engine and disassembled to the level specified in paragraph B and

(b) The part has accumulated more than 100 cycles since the last piece part inspection, provided that the part is not damaged or related to the cause of its removal from the engine.

(3) The inspections specified in this section do not replace or make unnecessary other recommended inspections for these parts or other parts.

B. Parts Requiring Inspection.

Note: Piece part is defined as any of the listed parts with all the blades removed.

Description	Section	Inspection
Hub (Disk), 1st Stage Compressor:		
5000501–01 (Hub detail).	72–33–31	–02,–03
5000421–01 (Hub assembly).	72–33–31	–02,–03''

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this AD, and notwithstanding contrary provisions in section 43.16 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.16), these mandatory inspections shall be performed only in accordance with the TLS of the PW JT8D–200 EM.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Engine Certification Office. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector (PMI), who may add comments and then send it to the Engine Certification Office.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Engine Certification Office.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) FAA-certificated air carriers that have an approved continuous airworthiness maintenance program in accordance with the record keeping requirement of § 121.369(c) of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR 121.369(c)] of this chapter must maintain records of the mandatory inspections that result from revising the Time Limits section of the Instructions for Continuous Airworthiness (ICA) and the air carrier's continuous airworthiness program. Alternately, certificated air carriers may establish an approved system of record retention that provides a method for preservation and retrieval of the maintenance records that include the inspections resulting from this AD, and include the policy and procedures for implementing this alternate method in the air carrier's maintenance manual required by § 121.369(c) of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR 121.369(c)]; however, the alternate system must be accepted by the appropriate PMI and require the maintenance records be maintained either indefinitely or until the work is repeated. Records of the piece-part inspections are not required under § 121.380(a)(2)(vi) of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR 121.380(a)(2)(vi)]. All other Operators must maintain the records of mandatory inspections required by the applicable regulations governing their operations.

Note 3: The requirements of this AD have been met when the engine manual changes are made and air carriers have modified their continuous airworthiness maintenance plans to reflect the requirements in the engine manuals.

(b) This amendment becomes effective on July 8, 1999.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on June 1, 1999.

Mark C. Fulmer,

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

[FR Doc. 99–14447 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

17 CFR Part 5

Fees for Applications for Contract Market Designation

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Final reduction of certain designation applications fees.

SUMMARY: The staff reviews periodically the Commission's actual costs of processing applications for contract market designation (17 CFR Part 5, Appendix B) and adjusts its schedule of fees accordingly. As a result of the most recent review, the Commission, as proposed on April 22, 1999 (64 FR 19730), is establishing reduced fees for a limited class of simultaneously submitted multiple contract designation application filings.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 8, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Shilts, Division of Economic Analysis, (201) 418–5275, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st, Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581. E-mail [Rshilts@cftc.gov].

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. History

On August 23, 1983, the Commission established a fee for contract market designation (48 FR 38214). The fee was based upon a three-year moving average of the actual costs and the number of contracts reviewed by the Commission during that period of time. The formula for determining the fee was revised in 1985. At that time, most of the designation applications were for futures contracts rather than option contracts, and the same fee was applied to both futures and option designation applications.

In 1992, the Commission reviewed its data on the actual costs for reviewing designation applications for both futures and option contracts and determined that the cost of reviewing a futures contract designation application was much higher than the cost of reviewing an option contract designation. It also determined that, when designation applications for both a futures contract and an option on that futures contract was submitted simultaneously, the cost for reviewing both together was lower than for reviewing the contracts separately. Based on that finding, three separate fees were established—one for futures alone, one for options alone, and one for combined futures and option contract applications. 57 FR 1372 (January 14, 1992). The combined futures/option designation application fee is set at a level that is less than the aggregate fee for separate futures and option applications to reflect the fact that the cost for review of an option is lower when submitted simultaneously with the underlying future and to create an incentive for contract markets to

submit simultaneously applications for futures and options on that future.

A. Proposed Further Modifications to Fee Structure

In a **Federal Register** notice dated April 22, 1999 (64 FR 19730), the Commission proposed to establish reduced fees for certain types of simultaneously submitted multiple contract designation applications. The Commission did not receive any comments in response to that notice.

II. Final Fee Structure

The Commission has determined to modify, as proposed, its fee structure for the limited class of multiple designation applications submitted simultaneously relating to contracts: (i) which are cash settled based on an index representing measurements of physical properties or financial characteristics which are not traded per se in the cash market; (ii) which use the same procedures for determining the cash-settlement values for all contracts in the filing; (iii) as to which the procedure for determining the values which vary for the individual cash settlement prices is objective and the individual contract values represent a spatial or other variant of that procedure or a larger or smaller multiplier; and (iv) as to which all other times and conditions are the same.[1] Commission fees for simultaneous submission of such multiple cash-settled contracts would be equal to the prevailing applicable fee for the first contract plus 10 percent of that fee for each additional contract in the filing. This fee structure represents an extension of the policy adopted by the Commission in 1992 when it established reduced fees for option applications and for combined futures and option applications and would be consistent with the Commission's responsibility under the Independent Offices Appropriations Act (31 U.S.C. 9107 (1982)) to base fees on the costs to the Government.

The Commission believes that a 10 percent marginal fee for additional contracts in a filing is appropriate for applications submitted simultaneously that are eligible for the multiple-contract filing fee. Because the multiple-contract filing fee applies only to cash-settled contracts based on objectively determined index values such that each separate contract represents only a spatial or other variant of that process and because the index is a measurement of a physical property or a financial characteristic which is not traded per se in the cash market, the Commission's review likely will not require a separate detailed analysis of each of the contracts in the filing. Moreover, for contracts meeting the standard for the multiple contract filing fee, the Commission's review of the cash settlement mechanism would involve a single analysis of the nature of the index and the process by which the underlying index values are determined. Separate comprehensive evaluations for each individual index would not be required since the same calculations apply to each. Since the underlying instruments are not traded in the cash market, the Commission need not conduct separate reviews of the underlying cash markets or the reliability or transparency of prices for the individual commodities. Because each contract must use an identical cash-settlement procedure and all other material terms and conditions must be the same (except for the differentiated term or the specified contract multiplier), the analysis of the cash settlement procedure for one contract would apply in large part to each of the additional contracts. Finally, because each contract in a filing must be differentiated only with respect to a single term or contract size feature that is not likely to affect the integrity of the cash settlement mechanism, each separate contract would not require a separate comprehensive analysis to ascertain its compliance with the requirements for designation.

The Commission notes that, regardless of the fee assessed for designation applications, the Commission will continue to conduct the same comprehensive review to ensure that each proposed contract meets all requirements for designation set forth in the Commission's Guideline on Economic and Public Interest Requirements for Contract Market Designation, 17 CFR Part 5, Appendix A (''Guideline No. 1'').[2] However, as explained above, for the types of applications covered by the multiple contract filing fee, the Commission's analysis of the case settlement procedure in general and its review of the other material terms and conditions likely would be applicable to each contract in the filing. Only a limited incremental analysis would be required to assess whether each additional contract in such a filing meets the designation requirements of Guideline No. 1, resulting in a much higher degree of efficiency in reviewing the applications and substantially reducing the marginal cost for reviewing and processing the additional contracts. The Commission's extensive experience in reviewing new contract designation applications indicates that, for simultaneously submitted multiple contract filings meeting the specified standards, a fee for each additional contract equal to 10 percent of the single contract application fee would reflect the Commission's expected review costs for these types of applications. To the extent the Commission finds otherwise, this fee will be adjusted in subsequent years.

The Commission wishes to make clear that the reduced option fee for the limited class of multiple-designation applications applies only to options on futures applications and not to options on physicals applications.

Under the new procedures noted above, the Commission's multiple contract designation application fees for filings meeting the standard discussed above are as follows: For filings involving multiple cash-settled futures—$6,800 for the first contract, plus $680 for each additional contract; for filings involving multiple options on cash-settled futures—$1,200 for the first contract, plus $140 for each additional contract; and for filings involving multiple combined cash-settled futures and options on those futures—$7,500 for the first futures and option contract, plus $750 for each additional futures and option contract. To be eligible for the reduced fees, contract markets must label the submission as a multiple contract filing and identify the cash settlement procedure to be used and the nature of the differentiated term or the different contract size specifications and justify why the application qualifies for this reduced fee.

[1] In this regard, contracts having differentiated spatial features include contracts that are identical in all respects including the cash settlement mechanism but which may be based on the application of differing objectively determined values for different geographical areas. These may include contracts on weather-related data or vacancy rates for rental properties, where each individual contract is based on the value—temperature, local vacancy rate, etc.—for a specific city. To be eligible for the multiple contract filing fee, each contract must be cash-settled based on the same underlying data source and derived under identical calculation procedures such that the integrity of the cash settlement mechanism is not dependent on the individual contract specifications and that values which vary are derived objectively using the same source or type of data. Thus, for example, applications containing a number of similar cash-settled contracts based on indexes of government debt of different foreign countries would not be eligible for the reduced fee since the manipulation potential of each contract would be related to the liquidity of the underlying instruments and the individual trading practices and governmental oversight in each specific country, requiring separate analyses.

[2] Guideline No. 1 details the information that an applicant for contract market designation should include in order to demonstrate that the contract market meets the economic requirements for designation.

III. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (''RFA''), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, requires agencies in proposing rules, to consider the impact of those rules on small businesses. The fees implemented in this release affect contract markets (also referred to as ''exchanges'') and a registered futures association. The Commission has previously determined that contract markets are not ''small entities'' for purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, 47 FR 18618 (April 30, 1982). Therefore, the Chairperson, on behalf of the Commission, certifies, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), that the fees herein will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 2, 1999, by the Commission.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 99–14390 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 178

[Docket No. 97F–0421]

Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers; Technical Amendment

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule; technical amendment.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending a final rule that appeared in the **Federal Register** of January 19, 1999 (64 FR 2854). The document amended the food additive regulations to provide for the safe use of di-*tert*-butyl-*m*-cresyl phosphonite condensation product with biphenyl for use as an antioxidant and/or stabilizer for olefin polymers intended for use in contact with food. The document was published with an error. This document corrects that error.

DATES: This regulation is effective January 19, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hortense S. Macon, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–206), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–418–3086.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of January 19, 1999 (64 FR 2854), FDA amended the food additive regulations to provide for the safe use of di-*tert*-butyl-*m*-cresyl phosphonite condensation product with biphenyl for use as an antioxidant and/or stabilizer for olefin polymers intended for use in contact with food. The nomenclature of the additive was modified to include the term ''meta'' (*m*). This term was placed between ''butyl'' and ''cresyl'' in the name of the subject additive and between ''butyl'' and ''cresol'' in the name of one of the starting materials to provide more accurate and descriptive names.

In the preferred chemical nomenclature, the addition of ''*m*'' necessitates the use of a different numbering convention in the name of the starting material than is used in the absence of ''*m*''. In the final rule, the agency inadvertently omitted this renumbering in the name of the starting material. Therefore, the agency is amending 21 CFR 178.2010 to correct the error.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 178

Food additives, Food packaging.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, and redelegated to the Director, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, 21 CFR part 178 is amended as follows:

PART 178—INDIRECT FOOD ADDITIVES: ADJUVANTS, PRODUCTION AIDS, AND SANITIZERS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 178 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321, 342, 348, 379e.

§ 178.2010 [Amended]

2. Section 178.2010 *Antioxidants and/or stabilizers for polymers* is amended in the table in paragraph (b) in the entry for ''di-*tert*-butyl-*m*-cresyl phosphonite * * *'' by removing ''2,4-di-*tert*-butyl-*m*-cresol'' and by adding in its place ''4,6-di-*tert*-butyl-*m*-cresol''.

Dated: June 1, 1999.

L. Robert Lake,

Director, Office of Policy, Planning and Strategic Initiatives, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition.

[FR Doc. 99–14518 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 520

Oral Dosage Form New Animal Drugs; Decoquinate; Technical Amendment

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule; technical amendment.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending a final rule that provided for adding a dry powder containing decoquinate to whole milk to be fed to calves for prevention of coccidiosis. The document incorrectly referred to those calves as replacement calves in the heading of § 520.534(d) (21 CFR 520.534(d)) for conditions of use. This document amends the regulation to state that decoquinate is for use in calves.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 2, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janis R. Messenheimer, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–135), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301–827–7578.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of March 2, 1999 (64 FR 10103), FDA added § 520.534 to reflect approval of Alpharma Inc.'s new animal drug application (NADA 141–060) for use of 0.8 percent decoquinate powder in whole milk for ruminating and nonruminating calves including veal calves. In the heading for § 520.534(d), the document incorrectly stated that decoquinate medicated milk was for use in replacement calves. This document amends the heading for § 520.534(d) to state that decoquinate is for use in calves by removing the word ''replacement''.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 520

Animal drugs.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Center for Veterinary Medicine, 21 CFR part 520 is amended as follows:

PART 520—ORAL DOSAGE FORM NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 520 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 360b.

§ 520.534 [Amended]

2. Section 520.534 *Decoquinate* is amended in the heading for paragraph