summarizing each FAA-public contact, concerned with the substance of the proposed AD, will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: Comments to Docket No. 90-ANE-08. The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter.

One GE CF6-80A3 engine aft mount lower beam has been found with a forging lap. The omission of a dip etch in the manufacturing process allowed the forging lap to go undetected during the final fluorescent penetrant inspection (FPI).

The FAA has determined that the required dip etch was omitted from the manufacturing process of all GE CF6-80A3 engine aft mount beam assemblies, this compromising the effectiveness of the final FPI. Consequently, forging laps may exist on other CF6-80A3 engine aft upper and lower mount beams which could result in cracking and subsequently lead to failure of an engine aft mount beam. Since this condition is likely to exist or develop on other engines of the same type design, the proposed AD would require the inspection of engine aft mount upper and lower beams on certain GE CF6-80A3 turbofan engines.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation involves 92 engines and the approximate cost would be $5000 per engine with an approximate total cost of $460,000. It has also been determined that few, if any, small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act will be affected since the proposed rule affects only operators of Airbus A310-200 aircraft in which GE CF6-80A3 engines are installed, none of which are believed to be small entities. Therefore, I certify that this action (1) is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the regulatory docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Regional Rules Docket.

### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, and Safety.

### The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes to amend 14 CFR part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) as follows:

## PART 39—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g) (Revised Pub. L. 97-449, January 12, 1983); and 14 CFR 11.89.

### § 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):

**General Electric Company:** Applies to General Electric Company (GE) CF6-80A3 turbofan engines installed on, but not limited to Airbus A310-200 aircraft.

Compliance required at the next engine removal or within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, unless already accomplished.

To prevent failure of the engine aft mount, which could result in engine separation, accomplish the following:

(a) Conduct an "in shop" dip etch and fluorescent penetrant inspection of the engine aft upper mount beam, Part Number (P/N) 224-1606-501 or 224-1606-503, and engine aft lower mount beam, P/N 224-1607-501, in accordance with the accomplishment instructions contained in Part 2 of GE CF6-80A Series Service Bulletin (SB) 71-053, Revision 1, dated February 8, 1990.

(b) Remove from service prior to further flight, engine aft upper and lower mounts with crack indications.

(c) Aircraft may be ferried in accordance with the provisions of FAR 21.197 and 21.199 to a base where the AD can be accomplished.

(d) Upon submission of substantiating data by an owner or operator through an FAA Airworthiness Inspector, an alternate method of compliance with the requirements of this AD or adjustments to the compliance (schedule) times specified in this AD may be approved by the Manager, Engine Certification Office, ANE-140, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, Massachusetts 01803.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on April 26, 1990.

**Arthur J. Pidgeon,**

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

[FR Doc. 90-10493 Filed 5-4-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Minerals Management Service

### 30 CFR Parts 202, 206, 210, and 212

### Revision of Geothermal Resources Valuation Regulations and Related Topics

May 1, 1990.

**AGENCY:** Minerals Management Service (MMS), Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of reopening the public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Minerals Management Service (MMS) hereby gives notice that it is reopening the public comment period on its proposed rulemaking to amend and clarify existing regulations defining the value for royalty purposes of geothermal resources produced from Federal lands administered by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. The MMS is reopening the comment period for 30 days to obtain additional public comments on the rate of return applicable to capital investment and other issues.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before June 6, 1900.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be mailed to the Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, Rules and Procedures Branch, Denver Federal Center, Building 85, P.O. Box 25165, Mail Stop 3910, Denver, Colorado 80225, Attention: Dennis C. Whitcomb.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dennis C. Whitcomb, Chief, Rules and Procedures Branch, telephone (303) 231-3432 of (FTS) 326-3432.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The MMS published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Revision of Geothermal Resources Valuation Regulations in the **Federal Register** on January 5, 1989 (54 FR 354). The original public comment period closed on April 17, 1989, after having been extended from March 6, 1989. The public is invited to provide additional comments on the issue described below:

*Section 206.352 Valuation Standards for Electrical Generation*

The proposed regulations provide for a netback procedure to be applied in valuing geothermal resources in situations where there was not an arm's-length sale of the geothermal resource and the resource was utilized in the generation of electricity. The netback procedure involves the subtraction from the sales value of the generated electricity of the costs incurred to generate and transmit the electricity. The resulting "net" value is used to define the value of the geothermal resource. A common concern regarding the netback calculation received in the public comments is the rate of return allowed on invested capital used in the determination of the transmission and generating deductions. A return on investment is provided to compensate the lessee for the cost of capital necessary to fund construction of the powerplant and transmission facilities. The rate of return specified in the proposed regulations for determining transmission and generating deductions is 1.5 times the Standard and Poor's BBB industrial bond rate.

During the comment period, many commenters disagreed with the proposed netback procedure but few commenters offered alternative rates of return for use in the netback procedure that they believed would adequately recognize the risks involved in developing geothermal projects. The Geothermal Resources Association objected to the netback procedure and recommended a "proportion of profits" approach. The netback and the proportion of profits approach, however, are mathematically identical except for the choice of the rate of return. The proportion of profits approach uses a rate of return based upon actual net income from a project while the proposed regulation would use the same rate for all projects.

In an effort to fully balance the concerns that the royalty valuation regulations should not work to impede further development of the resources while providing the public a fair value for the resource, MMS believes that it needs additional information before it can conclude its assessment of the alternative valuation methods presented in the proposed rulemaking. Therefore, MMS is specifically requesting additional comments on the rate or rates of return that are most appropriate for use in the netback procedure. Respondents should provide rationale for any recommended rate of return including references to public information or other sources that provide a factual basis for the recommendation.

In addition, if circumstances have arisen since the close of the comment period on April 17, 1989, which allow the respondent to give additional comments on any other issue called for in the first notice, MMS welcomes this new information. It is not necessary for commenters to resubmit previous comments since those comments already are included in the rulemaking record.

Dated: May 1, 1990.

**Donald T. Sant,**

*Acting Associate Director for Royalty Management.*

[FR Doc. 90-10504 Filed 5-4-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Family Support Administration

### 45 CFR Parts 233, 234 and 235

**RIN 0970-AA75**

### Aid to Families With Dependent Children

**AGENCY:** Family Support Administration (FSA), HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** These proposed rules implement three sections of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1987, Public Law 100-203, that apply to the Aid to Families with Department Children (AFDC) program. They are: (1) *Section 9101*, which permanently extends the optional disregard of certain in-kind assistance in determining eligibility for and the amount of AFDC; (2) *section 9102*, which authorizes States to establish an optional fraud control program; and (3) *section 9133*, which provides that a child whose support and maintenance costs are covered in the foster care payment of his or her minor parent may not be regarded as a member of an AFDC family.

In addition, these proposed rules also implement section 1883 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Public Law 99-514, which requires that a recipient who receives foster care maintenance payments under title IV-E of the Social Security Act may not be regarded as a member of an AFDC family.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by July 6, 1990.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be submitted in writing to the Acting Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Attention: Mr. Mark Ragan Acting Director, Division of Policy, Office of Family Assistance, Fifth Floor, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447. Comments may be inspected between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. during regular business days by making arrangements with the contract person identified below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Mark Ragan, Office of Family Assistance, Fifth Floor, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447, telephone (202) 252-5116.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Discussion of Proposed Rule Provisions

*Exclusion of a Foster Care Recipient*

Section 1883(b)(10) of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Public Law 99-514, added section 478 to title IV-E of the Social Security Act. Section 478 provides that a child with respect to whom foster care maintenance payments under title IV-E are made is not considered a member of an AFDC assistance unit and the child's income and resources are not counted in determining AFDC eligibility and payment amount. Accordingly, we are amending Federal regulations at §§ 233.20 (a)(1)(ii), 233.20 (a)(3)(vi), and 233.20 (a)(3)(x) to exclude the needs, income, and resources of such children from consideration under AFDC.

The exclusion of an individual under section 478 is limited only to a child who receives foster care maintenance payments as defined by section 475(4) and authorized by section 472 of title IV-E of the Social Security Act. The exclusion does not extend to individuals receiving payments under the Federal adoption assistance program as set forth in section 473 of title IV-E of the Act or to payments under State-only foster care or adoption assistance programs. Thus, there is no statutory basis for not applying section 402(a)(38) to these invididuals. However, States are permitted to apportion such grants or payments to the adult or child according to the designation of the grant. For example, States typically designate State-funded foster care payments to cover specific costs, such as food, clothing, shelter, school supplies, personal incidentals, or travel expenses for visitation. Any portion of the grant which is clearly designated for the foster parent and which is not used for the maintenance of the child is therefore not counted as income to the child. Moreover, any items attributable to the child which are not covered by the AFDC need standard may be disregarded under the complementary program rule at § 233.20(a)(3)(vii).