

This AD does not apply to circuit breakers produced or installed prior to July 23, 1984, (the thirtieth week of 1984), or to circuit breakers which have been inspected by the manufacturer, found free of defect, marked with a white inverted Z or a T painted on the terminal end, and have an additional date code with an "R" prefix.

Note 1: As an aid in identification, the bodies of these circuit breakers are blue or black in color.

Note 2: The date codes listed above are used to identify the year and week of manufacture, i.e., 8430 indicates the thirtieth week of 1984, and 8636 indicates the thirty-sixth week of 1986. These date codes may be found on the top, side, or bottom of the circuit breakers.

Note 3: As an example the unit may have the additional date code of R8642, where "R" designates a retest by Mechanical Products, 86 indicates the year 1986, and 42 indicates the 42nd week of 1986.

Compliance: Required within six months after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

To prevent possible loss of essential equipment, electrical fire, or electrical shock hazard on aircraft, accomplish the following:

(a) Visually inspect for installation in aircraft of any of the applicable circuit breakers in accordance with the instructions contained in Mechanical Products Service Instruction (identification on the back page with the date 10/86) and prior to further flight remove all units from service. Applicable aircraft records may be a source of information in complying with the requirements of this AD.

(b) Return all affected circuit breakers to Mechanical Products, Inc., 1824 River Street, Post Office Box 729, Jackson, Michigan 49204.

(c) Aircraft may be flown in accordance with FAR 21.197 to a location where the AD may be accomplished.

(d) An adjustment to the compliance time or an equivalent means of compliance with this AD may be used if approved by the Manager, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, ACE-115C, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the documents referred to herein upon request to Mechanical Products, Inc., 1824 River Street, Post Office Box 729, Jackson, Michigan 49204; or FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Room 1558, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 7, 1986.

Jerold M. Chavkin,
Acting Director, Central Region.

[FR Doc. 86-25921 Filed 11-17-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-3-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

27 CFR Part 9

[Notice No. 612]

Old Mission Peninsula Viticultural Area; Michigan

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), is considering the establishment of a viticultural area in Grand Traverse County, Michigan, to be known as "Old Mission Peninsula." The proposed viticultural area is located in the northwestern portion of the state's lower peninsula. The petition was submitted by a winery located in the proposed area. ATF believes that the establishment of viticultural areas and the subsequent use of viticultural area names as appellations of origin in wine labeling and advertising will help consumers identify the wines they may purchase. The establishment of viticultural areas allows wineries to further specify the origin of wines they offer for sale to the public.

DATES: Written comments must be received by January 2, 1987.

ADDRESS: Send written comments to: Chief, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, P.O. Box 385, Washington, DC, 20044-0385.

(Notice No. 612).

Copies of the petition, the proposed regulations, the appropriate maps, and written comments will be available for public inspection during normal business hours at: ATF Reading Room, Room 4406, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward A. Reisman, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226 (202-566-7626).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 23, 1978, ATF published Treasury Decision ATF-53 (43 FR 37672, 54624) revised regulations in 27 CFR Part 4. These regulations allow the establishment of definite viticultural areas.

On October 2, 1979, ATF published Treasury Decision ATF-60 (44 FR 56692) which added a new Part 9 to 27 CFR, providing for the listing of approved American viticultural areas, the names of which may be used as appellations of origin.

Section 4.25a(e)(1), Title 27, CFR, defines an American viticultural area as a delimited grape-growing region distinguishable by geographical features, the boundaries of which have been delineated in Subpart C of Part 9.

Section 4.25a(e)(2), outlines the procedure for proposing an American viticultural area. Any interested person may petition ATF to establish a grape-growing region as a viticultural area. The petition should include—:

(a) Evidence that the name of the proposed viticultural area is locally and/or nationally known as referring to the area specified in the petition;

(b) Historical or current evidence that the boundaries of the viticultural area are as specified in the petition;

(c) Evidence relating to the geographical characteristics (climate, soil, elevation, physical features, etc.) which distinguish the viticultural features of the proposed area from surrounding areas;

(d) A description of the specific boundaries of the viticultural area, based on features which can be found on United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) maps of the largest applicable scale; and

(e) A copy of the appropriate U.S.G.S. maps with the boundaries prominently marked.

Petition

AFT has received a petition proposing a viticultural area encompassing the narrow peninsula above Traverse City, Michigan. The proposed viticultural area is to be known as "Old Mission Peninsula." The petition was submitted by Edward O'Keefe, President of the Chateau Grand Traverse Winery, the only winery located in the proposed viticultural area. The proposed area consists of all the land in Peninsula Township (excluding Marion and Bassett Islands). It also includes a small portion of Traverse City Township. This peninsula is a sliver of land that juts out into Grand Traverse Bay, forming on its east side, the East Arm of Grand Traverse Bay and on its west side the West Arm of Grand Traverse Bay. The proposed viticultural area is approximately 19 miles long and no more than 3 miles wide at any point. The total area encompassed by the proposed boundaries consists of 181 square miles (101,440 acres) of land.

There are 50 acres of vinifera vineyards for wine production located in the proposed viticultural area with 31 more acres planned by 1989. The proposed area if approved as an American viticultural area will be one of Michigan's four recognized grape-growing regions. Leelanau Peninsula located nearby to the west (across Grand Traverse Bay) is one of them.

Evidence of Name

The petitioner claimed that the petitioned area is known as Old Mission Peninsula. He submitted historical documentation to support this statement. According to the book titled *Michigan History* by Virgil J. Vogel, the French voyagers who paddled southward on Lake Michigan from the Straits of Mackinac saw two indentations on the eastern shore. In crossing the bays from one headland to another, they called the smaller one La Petite Traverse (Old Mission Peninsula) and the larger La Grande Traverse (Leelanau Peninsula). Grand Traverse Bay is divided by Old Mission Peninsula, at the foot of which, is Traverse City.

According to documentation submitted by the petitioner, the settlement of the proposed viticultural area was begun by Reverend Peter Dougherty, who founded the first Indian school on the northeast shores of Old Mission Peninsula, at Mission Harbor. After the school was abandoned in 1952 a new school called "New Mission" was established in an area to the west, now known as Leelanau Peninsula (Leelanau County). From that time on, the old school became known as "Old Mission." At the same time the entire peninsula where the old school was situated became known as "Old Mission Peninsula." Today, this narrow strip of land is still referred to as "Old Mission Peninsula."

According to Leon D. Adams in *The Wines of America*, the Chateau Grand Traverse Winery was the first winery in recent history to plant vines and construct a winery on the Old Mission Peninsula.

Historical or Current Evidence That the Proposed Boundaries of the Viticultural Area Are Correct

The proposed Old Mission Peninsula viticultural area is bounded on three sides by the waters of Grand Traverse Bay, and connected on the south by the mainland of Michigan's lower peninsula, at Traverse City. The south boundary chosen by the petitioner, the unmarked light-duty road (known locally as Eastern Avenue) bordering on Northwestern Michigan College,

although a man-made boundary, coincidentally is the demarcation point between the Old Mission Peninsula and the inland areas of northwestern Michigan's lower peninsula.

Evidence Relating to the Geographic Features Such As Climate, Soil, Elevation, Physical Features, etc., Which Set the Proposed Viticultural Area Apart From the Surrounding Areas

The petitioner furnished information which identified the proposed area as a fruit-growing region (cherries, peaches, plums, apples, berries and grapes) for over 100 years. According to this information, the region is world famous for the production of cherries and other agricultural products. The petitioner claims that Grand Traverse County leads the nation (and world) in cherry production. He claims the majority of those cherries come from Old Mission Peninsula.

In a report titled, *The Grand Traverse County Region* (on the Geological and Industrial Resources of the Counties of Antrim, Grand Traverse, Benzie and Leelanau) published in 1866, it stated that grapes thrive throughout the region. The report said that at New Mission (Old Mission Peninsula), Isabella and Catawba grapes were growing. In recent years there has been a revival in interest in grape-growing for commercial purposes in the proposed viticultural area. The one bonded winery in the proposed viticultural area was established in 1975. The petitioner claims the peninsula is isolated and distinguishable from the surrounding area by virtue of natural boundaries and unique geographical features.

Climate

According to the petitioner a climatic heritage of favorable summer and winter climate caused by the moderating influence of Lake Michigan is most pronounced in the Grand Traverse Region (as previously described this area includes Old Mission Peninsula, Leelanau Peninsula and a few surrounding counties). The southwest winds must sweep the whole length of Lake Michigan before crossing the shores of the Grand Traverse Region.

The petitioner enclosed a letter from the Grand Traverse County Cooperative Extension Service detailing the unique features of the proposed Old Mission Peninsula. According to Steven B. Fouch, Extension Agricultural Agent of the Cooperative Extension Service (Michigan State University/U.S. Department of Agriculture), the proximity to Grand Traverse Bay and the southwesterly breezes off Lake Michigan tend to moderate air

temperature on the Old Mission Peninsula. This results in mild winters, delayed springs, and relatively cool summers.

Just as Lake Michigan tempers the Grand Traverse Region in general, the surrounding deep waters of the Grand Traverse Bay, coupled with southwesterly winds carrying warmth from the mainland, create a microclimate on the Old Mission Peninsula. The Peninsula, then, is doubly tempered; once from the Lake Michigan effects, and again by the Grand Traverse Bay. This additional insulating effect of the bay is reflected in differences in total degree growing days between Old Mission Peninsula, Traverse City, and Leelanau Peninsula.

Data gathered from a National Weather Service summary for the 15-year period (1962-1976) and for the 2-year period (1980-1981) in western Michigan, was provided by the petitioner. Total growing degree days for Old Mission Peninsula at base 50 (the base temperature used for grapes as well as cherries) averages 2,075 degree days (15 year period), whereas, Traverse City and Leelanau Peninsula average 2,134 degree days over a 2-year period and 2,109 degree days over a 15-year period, respectively. However, even though total growing degree days afforded fruit crops on the Old Mission Peninsula are less in number, they are virtually frost-free, as has been experienced by local fruit growers. In contrast, area frosts have been known to wipe out identical crops in the surrounding Grand Traverse Region, with little or no damage reported on the isolated Old Mission Peninsula. Therefore, temperature variations in both the spring and fall seasons are markedly more moderate on the Old Mission Peninsula than in the immediate surrounding areas.

Soils & Topography

Although not the major distinguishing feature of the proposed Old Mission Peninsula, the soils in the proposed viticultural area vary widely, as is always the case when land is formed by glacial action and deposits. The soil levels consist of granite and limestone bedrock, clay subsoils. The Old Mission Peninsula soil type is of the Leelanau-Kalkaska series, a sandy loam that provides good drainage for fruit crops. According to Mr. Fouch (the Extension Agricultural Agent), the Leelanau-Kalkaska sand loams dominate the soil profile on the peninsula. This well-drained soil has an acidic topsoil and alkaline subsoil.

To contrast, the soils of the Leelanau Peninsula viticultural area located to the west are characterized by large deep inland lakes which add an additional moderating effect to the climate, high rolling and heavily-timbered hills in the north, and undulating plateaus in the south which rise 250 to 400 feet above Lake Michigan.

According to Mr. Fouch, the proposed viticultural area's rolling hills overlook the east and west arms of Grand Traverse Bay and are among the prime fruit sites to be found anywhere. He said that cold spring frosts settle toward the ground and flow off the rolling topography to low areas. He also said fruit is generally much safer from spring frosts on higher elevations in the area.

Based on the petitioner's evidence provided in this notice, it is his opinion, that the proposed Old Missions Peninsula viticultural area defines a region with unique climate and growing conditions different from the surrounding areas.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to an initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis (5 U.S.C. 603, 604) are not applicable to this notice of proposed rulemaking because the proposal is not expected (1) to have significant secondary or incidental effects on a substantial number of small entities; or (2) to impose, or otherwise cause a significant increase in the reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance burdens on a substantial number of small entities.

Accordingly, it is hereby certified under the provisions of section 3 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)) that the notice of proposed rulemaking, if promulgated as a final rule, will not have a significant economic impact nor compliance burdens on a substantial number of small entities.

Compliance With Executive Order 12291

It has been determined that this proposed rulemaking is not classified as a "major rule" within the meaning of Executive Order 12291, 46 FR 13193 (1981), because it will not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; it will not result in a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographical regions; and it will not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of the United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-

based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-511, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 34, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, do not apply to this notice because no requirements to collect information is proposed.

Public Participation—Written Comments

ATF requests comments from all interested persons concerning this proposed viticultural area. The document proposes possible boundaries for the area named "Old Mission Peninsula" viticultural area. However, comments concerning other possible boundaries or names for this viticultural area will be given full consideration.

Comments received before the closing date will be carefully considered. Comments received after the closing date and too late for consideration will be treated as possible suggestions for future ATF action.

ATF will not recognize any material in comments as confidential. Comments may be disclosed to the public. Any material which the commenter considers to be confidential or inappropriate for disclosure to the public should not be included in the comments. The name of the person submitting a comment is not exempt from disclosure.

Any interested person who desires an opportunity to comment orally at a public hearing on these proposed regulations should submit his or her requests, in writing, to the Director within the 45-day comment period. The Director, however, reserves the right to determine, in light of all circumstances, whether a public hearing will be held.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practice and procedure, Viticultural areas, Consumer protection, Wine.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is Edward A. Reisman, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

Authority and Issuance

PART 9—[AMENDED]

27 CFR Part 9—American Viticultural areas is amended as follows:

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for Part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Par. 2. The table of contents in 27 CFR Part 9, Subpart C, is amended to add the title of 9.114 to read as follows:

Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

Sec.

* * * * *
9.114 Old Mission Peninsula.

Par. 3. Subpart C is amended by adding § 9.114 to read as follows:

Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

§ 9.114 Old Mission Peninsula.

(a) *Name.* The name of the viticultural area described in this section is "Old Mission Peninsula."

(b) *Approved Maps.* The appropriate maps for determining the boundaries of the "Old Mission Peninsula" viticultural area are 2 U.S.G.S. Quadrangle (15 Minute Series) maps, scaled at 1:62,500. They are entitled:

- (1) Elk Rapids, Mich. (1957); and
- (2) Traverse City, Mich. (1957).

(c) *Boundaries.* The boundaries of the proposed Old Mission Peninsula viticultural area are as follows: The boundaries in Grand Traverse County, Michigan, consist of all of Peninsula Township, excluding Marion and Bassett Islands. In addition, the proposed area takes in a small portion of Traverse City Township.

(1) The beginning point is on the Traverse City, Mich., U.S.G.S. map at the shoreline of the West Arm of Grand Traverse Bay at Section 1, (T27N, R11W), approximately 500 feet due west of the intersection of two unmarked light-duty roads (approx. 750 feet north of Bryant Park);

(2) The boundary proceeds north 19 miles along the western shoreline of the Old Mission Peninsula until it reaches the lighthouse near Old Mission Point at the north side of the Peninsula on the Elk Rapids, Mich., U.S.G.S. map, Sec. 23, T30N, R10W;

(3) It then proceeds south for approximately 19 miles along the eastern shoreline of the peninsula to the southeast portion of an unmarked light-duty road (known locally as Eastern Avenue) at Sec. 6, T27N, R10W on the Traverse City, Mich., U.S.G.S. map. The unmarked light-duty road is located immediately north of Northwestern Michigan College on the shoreline of the East Arm of the Grand Traverse Bay;

(4) The boundary travels west along the unmarked light-duty road (known locally as Eastern Avenue) for approx. 1 mile until it meets an unmarked north/south light-duty road at Sec. 1, T27N, R11W; and

(5) Finally, the boundary travels due east 500 feet to the beginning point on the shoreline of the West Arm of the Grand Traverse Bay at Sec. 1, T27N, R11W.

Approved: November 10, 1986.

Stephen E. Higgins,

Director.

[FR Doc. 86-25982 Filed 11-17-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4610-31-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[CGD13 85-07]

Anchorage Grounds; Columbia River, OR and WA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is considering a proposal by the Port of Portland, Oregon, and other Lower Columbia River ports to expand the existing Lower Columbia River Anchorage Grounds. The proposal seeks enlargement of and a change of names for the Upper and Lower Tongue Point Anchorages near Astoria, Oregon, and establishment of seven new anchorages between Longview, Washington, and Vancouver, Washington. The seven new anchorages are located as follows:

1. Between the Port of Longview docks and the main ship channel;
2. Along Sandy Island across the main ship channel from Kalama, Washington;
3. North of Sand Island across the main ship channel from Columbia City, Oregon;
4. Along Sauvie Island across the main ship channel from Bachelor Point;
5. Across the main ship channel from Sauvie Island near Hewlett Point;
6. Between Kelley Point and the main ship channel; and
7. Along Hayden Island across the main ship channel from the Port of Vancouver.

The ports have asked for this expansion to enhance their ability to efficiently and economically handle existing shipping and to provide sufficient anchorage space to accommodate increases in shipping anticipated over the next 20 years.

In response to the ports' proposal, the Coast Guard Captain of the Port in Portland, Oregon, sponsored a number of meetings of port, terminal, and steamship representatives, local pilot organizations, and other river users including the Northwest Gillnetters

Association. Comments received at those meetings led to the development of specific regulations governing utilization and administration of the anchorages which have been incorporated into this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

If adopted as final rules, the Coast Guard intends to evaluate utilization of the new anchorages and make changes as necessary to meet the needs of river users.

DATE: Comments must be received on or before January 2, 1987.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, 6767 North Basin Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97217. The comments and other material referenced in this notice will be available for inspection and copying at 6767 North Basin Avenue, Portland, Oregon, Room 1114, Mt. St. Helens Building. Normal office hours are between 8:00 a.m. and 3:45 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Comments may also be hand-delivered to this address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LCDR N.S. PORTER, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, 6767 North Basin Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97217, (503) 240-9317.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Interested persons are invited to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written views, data or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their name and address, identify this notice (CGD13-85-07) and the specific section of the proposal to which their comments apply, and give reasons for each comment. Receipt of comments will be acknowledged if a stamped self-addressed postcard or envelope is enclosed.

The regulations may be changed in light of comments received. All comments received before the expiration of the comment period will be considered before final action is taken on this proposal. No public hearing is planned, but one may be held if written requests for a hearing are received and it is determined that the opportunity to make oral presentations will aid the rulemaking process.

Drafting Information

The drafters of this notice are LT M.P. RAND, USCG, and LCDR N. S. PORTER, USCG, Project Officers, Marine Safety Office Portland, Oregon, and LCDR L.I. KIERN, USCG, Project Attorney, Thirteenth Coast Guard District Legal Office, Seattle, Washington.

Discussion of Proposed Regulations

The existing Lower Columbia River Anchorage Grounds consist of two areas located near the mouth of the river at Astoria, Oregon. Historically, these areas have provided adequate anchorage space for vessels awaiting berth at the Port of Astoria and for vessels awaiting favorable conditions for transit of the Columbia River Bar. They have not, however, provided adequate space for vessels awaiting berth at any of the Columbia's upriver ports nor have they provided an economically practical anchorage area for vessel and facility operators who realize significant cost reductions from having ships anchored near their servicing terminals.

Over the years, the inadequacies of the existing anchorage grounds led vessel operators to anchor their ships in available upriver areas closer to their servicing terminals. Statistics provided by the Port of Portland show that approximately 1,000 such anchorings occurred during the period 1981 to 1983. Current growth projections indicate that this number could double by the year 2000. Although anchoring in this manner has not caused significant navigational problems, it has resulted in occasional conflicts with commercial drift fishing operations.

Prompted by the inadequacies of the existing anchorages and the projections for future growth, the ports of Portland, Astoria, Longview, Kalama, and Vancouver began an analysis of the Lower Columbia River anchorage situation in November, 1983. Their study, which included significant input from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, led to submission of a proposal in June, 1984, seeking enlargement of the existing areas and formal designation of eight additional upriver areas. Most of the proposed new anchorages coincided with areas which were already being utilized on an informal, but routine, basis.

In response to the ports' proposal, the Coast Guard Captain of the Port in Portland, Oregon, began a series of meetings with port, terminal, and vessel representatives, river and bar pilots, commercial fishermen, and state fishing authorities. Information presented at those meetings and developed from related studies led to elimination of one of the proposed anchorages and minor alteration of another. Additionally, the meetings led to identification of several public and governmental concerns which required attention if the ports' proposal was to be adopted. Chief among those concerns were the