Thus, both statutes have small entity orientation and compatibility.

There are approximately 135 producers of California dates under the marketing order and approximately 25 handlers. Small agricultural producers have been defined by the Small Business Administration (13 CFR 121.601) as those having annual receipts of less than $500,000, and small agricultural service firms are defined as those whose annual receipts are less than $5,000,000. The majority of California date producers and handlers may be classified as small entities.

The budget of expenses for the 1995–96 crop year was prepared by the California Date Administrative Committee, the agency responsible for local administration of the marketing order, and submitted to the Department for approval. The members of the Committee are producers and handlers of California dates. They are familiar with the Committee's needs and with the costs for goods and services in their local area and are, thus, in a position to formulate an appropriate budget. The budget was formulated and discussed in a public meeting. Thus, all directly affected persons have had an opportunity to participate and provide input.

The assessment rate recommended by the Committee was derived by dividing anticipated expenses by expected shipments of California dates. Because that rate will be applied to actual shipments, it must be established at a rate that will provide sufficient income to pay the Committee's expenses.

The Committee met on May 18, 1995, and by votes of 6 to 3 recommended a 1995–96 assessment rate and operating expenses and increased market promotion expenses to fund the Committee's marketing plan. The two handlers voting against the funding for the marketing plan believe individual handlers should do more advertising on their own; the other no vote came from a producer who expressed concerns about the outstanding assessments owed the Committee. However, the majority of Committee members expressed the need for the industry to work together to promote California dates and help reduce current inventories.

The 1995–96 budget of $774,218 is $203,218 more than the previous year. Included in the budgeted expenditures is an operating budget of $160,000, $24,865 more than last year, with a 26.25 percent surplus account allocation, for a net operating budget of $118,000, or $18,000 more than last year. Also included is $656,218 allocated for market promotion, $206,218 more than last year.

Budget items for 1995–96 which have increased compared to those budgeted for 1994–95 (in parentheses) are: Executive Director's salary, $66,000 ($57,500), Marketing Assistant's Salary, $24,000 ($18,500), health and welfare benefits, $10,500 ($8,500), payroll taxes, $8,000 ($5,814), rent, $7,500 ($7,000), professional services—accounting, $3,000 ($2,000), contingency, $5,200 ($221), consumer public relations, $151,500 ($60,000), consumer media, $336,218 ($265,000), industrial promotion, $115,000 ($30,000), and $13,000 for a secretary/receptionist and $6,000 for export promotion, for which no funding was recommended last year. Items which have decreased compared to the amount budgeted for 1994–95 (in parentheses) are: Copier lease and maintenance, $2,100 ($2,400), retail trade promotion, $35,000 ($45,000), and ($4,000) for equipment for marketing efforts, for which no funding was recommended this year. All other items are budgeted at last year's amounts.

The assessment rate of $2.25 per hundredweight is $0.75 more than last season. This rate, when applied to anticipated date shipments of 36,000,000 pounds (360,000 hundredweight), would yield $810,000 in assessable income. This, along with $1,000 in interest income, would result in $36,782 in excess income which would be allocated to the Committee's reserve. Funds in the reserve as of September 30, 1996, which the Committee estimates would be $235,782, should be within the maximum amount permitted by the order. Funds held by the Committee at the end of the crop year, including the reserve, which are in excess of the crop year's expenses may be used to defray expenses for four months and thereafter the Committee shall refund or credit the excess funds to the handlers.

While this action would impose some additional costs on handlers, the costs are in the form of uniform assessments on all handlers. Some of the additional costs may be passed on to producers. However, these costs would be offset by the benefits derived by the operation of the marketing order. Therefore, the Administrator of the AMS has determined that this action would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

A 30-day comment period is provided to allow interested persons to respond to this proposal. All written comments timely received will be considered before a final determination is made on this matter.

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 proposed to be 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. A new § 987.338 is added to read as follows:

§ 987.338 Expenses and assessment rate.

Expenses of $774,218 by the California Date Administrative Committee are authorized, and an assessment rate of $2.25 per hundredweight of assessable dates is established for the crop year ending September 30, 1996. Unexpended funds may be carried over as a reserve within the limitations specified in § 987.72(c) and (d).

Dated: July 31, 1995.

Martha B. Ransom,

Acting Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.

[FR Doc. 95–19332 Filed 8–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Parts 20, 30, 40, 50, 51, 70, and 72

RIN 3150–AD65

Radiological Criteria for Decommissioning

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; Announcement of extension in schedule.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing an extension in the schedule for the final rule on radiological criteria for decommissioning. The reason for the extension is to allow the NRC to more fully consider public comments received on the technical information base supporting the proposed rule and to develop the implementing regulatory guidance to be issued with the final rule. It is expected that the final rule will be issued in early 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John E. Glenn, (301) 415–6187, or Frank

Cardile, (301) 415–6185, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 22, 1994, the Commission issued a **Federal Register** notice (FRN) (59 FR 43200) requesting public comment on a proposed amendment to its regulations which would provide specific radiological criteria for the decommissioning of lands and structures at NRC-licensed nuclear facilities. The FRN announced that the public comment period was to close on December 20, 1994. Subsequently, the public comment period was extended to January 22, 1995. To date, 101 comment letters have been received. The comments contained in these letters are being characterized and considered in the development of a final rule.

The preliminary schedule of the final rule anticipated issuance of a final rule in the summer of 1995. However, the NRC has decided to extend the date for issuance of this rule to allow it to more fully consider public comments received on the technical information base supporting the proposed rule and to develop the implementing regulatory guidance to be issued with the final rule. The rationale for the extension is discussed more fully below.

Characterization of the comments on the proposed rule and the supporting technical basis has indicated that a number of comments were received regarding the adequacy of the risk and cost analysis supporting the proposed criteria in the rule. One particular area questioned was whether the reference facilities used in the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement DGEIS (NUREG–1496) as a basis for the analyses adequately model the complex contamination situations occurring at nuclear facilities. The intent of the analysis in the DGEIS was to employ reference sites and to perform screening analyses. In support of this effort, the NRC staff used site data, where available, supplemented by engineering judgment and theoretical analyses.

However, the NRC staff believes that the supporting information bases for the final rule will be significantly improved by including an evaluation of addItional data from site characterizations and decommissionings. Although the real world data are not as complete as might be wished, there are data on total costs, volumes of waste, survey costs and concentrations left at release that the staff believes can be useful. The information generated through this evaluation will be used in considering how to resolve public comments on the proposed rule including the appropriateness of the 15 mrem/yr limit for release of a site for unrestricted use contained in 10 CFR 20.1404(a) and the criteria for allowing restricted release contained in 10 CFR 20.1405.

In addition to its further analysis of public comments, the NRC staff has decided that, prior to release of a final rule, it would assess its planned regulatory guide implementation model to provide assurance that the model is an adequately conservative screening tool and is capable of incorporating more realistic scenarios than those in the basic screening version. In particular, this assessment would include a sensitivity analysis of the NUREG/CR–5512 modeling methodology to determine the acceptable range of parameters for screening analyses. The NRC staff is considering holding a public meeting in September 1995 to address specific issues associated with development of regulatory guidance implementing the final rule. More detailed information about that meeting will be provided in the near future.

Based on the activities discussed above with regard to the assessment of the supporting analysis, and the further development of the regulatory guidance, the staff expects to provide a final rule to the Commission during December 1995, and to issue a final rule in early 1996.

Separate Views of Commissioner de Planque: I agree with the Commission's decision to allow staff additional time to consider public comments on the proposed final rule on radiological criteria for decommissioning. I have read virtually all of the public comments and conclude that two major issues not specifically identified in this FRN need to be carefully considered by the staff before proceeding to finalize the rule. These are: (1) Is there an adequate technical basis for selecting a dose criterion of 15 mrem in contrast to a 25 or 30 mrem value that would be consistent with the recommendations of international and national organizations for radiation protection? Staff's examination of this issue should consider the cost/benefit basis for selecting a value. (2) Are the fundamental, underlying assumptions used in the models, in particular, the assumption of a 70-year residence and significant subsistence farming on a decommissioned site, realistic and appropriate to apply to decommissioned sites in the U.S.? Unnecessarily conservative assumptions will lead to cleanup of radioactivity to levels so low that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to determine compliance and the effort will be extremely expensive for licensees.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19 day of July, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James M. Taylor,

Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 95–19358 Filed 8–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–CE–25–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft SA226 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to certain Fairchild Aircraft SA226 series airplanes equipped with a part number (P/N) 27–5500–229 actuator assembly. The proposed action would require replacing the main landing gear door actuator tang and associated hardware with parts of improved design. Reports of the main landing gear doors hanging up and locking the landing gear links on the affected airplanes prompted the proposed action. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent the inability to extend the main landing gear because of the main landing gear door actuation roller contacting the lower edge of the tang and causing the linkage to lock over-center.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before September 29, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–CE–25–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from Fairchild Aircraft, P.O. Box 790490, San Antonio, Texas 78279–0490; telephone (210) 824–9421. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Werner Koch, Aerospace Engineer,