Budget expense categories	2004–05	2005–06
Administrative Staff/Field Salaries & Benefits	$332,000	$360,000
Travel/Board Expenses	69,000	80,000
Office Costs/Annual Audit	124,000	132,500
Program Expenses Including Research Controlled Purchases	5,000	5,000
Crop Acreage Survey	.....	85,000
Crop Estimate	94,000	95,000
Production Research Director	76,500	75,000
Production Research	548,500	500,000
Domestic Market Development	1,393,500	1,550,000
Reserve for Contingency	107,000	55,100

The Board reviewed and unanimously recommended 2005–06 expenditures of $2,937,600, which included an increase in audit expenses. Prior to arriving at this budget, the Board considered alternative expenditure levels, but ultimately decided that the recommended levels were reasonable to properly administer the order. The assessment rate recommended by the Board was derived by dividing anticipated expenses by expected shipments of California walnuts certified as merchantable. Merchantable shipments for the year are estimated at 306,000,000 kernelweight pounds which should provide $2,937,600 in assessment income and allow the Board to cover its expenses. Unexpended funds may be used temporarily to defray expenses of the subsequent marketing year, but must be made available to the handlers from whom collected within 5 months after the end of the year, according to § 984.69.

According to NASS, the season average grower prices for years 2003 and 2004 were $1,160 and $1,350 per ton respectively. Dividing these average grower prices by 2,000 pounds per ton provides an inshell price per pound range of between $.58 and $.68. Adjusting by a few cents above and below those prices ($0.55 to $0.70 per inshell pound) provides a reasonable price range within which the 2005–06 season average price is likely to fall. Dividing these inshell prices per pound by the 0.45 conversion factor designated in the order yields a 2005–06 price range estimate of $1.22 and $1.56 per kernelweight pound of assessable walnuts.

To calculate the percentage of grower revenue represented by the assessment rate, the assessment rate of $0.0096 (per kernelweight pound) is divided into the low and high estimates of the price range. The estimated assessment revenue for the 2005–06 marketing year as a percentage of total grower revenue would likely range between .8 and .6 percent.

This action would increase the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While assessments impose some additional costs on handlers, the costs are minimal and uniform 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. In addition, the Board's meeting was widely publicized throughout the California walnut industry and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Board deliberations on all issues. Like all Board meetings, the September 9, 2005, meeting was a public meeting and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue. Finally, interested persons are invited to submit information on the regulatory and informational impacts of this action on small businesses.

This proposed rule would impose no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large California walnut 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 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.

A 10-day comment period is provided to allow interested persons to respond to this proposed rule. Ten days is deemed appropriate because: (1) The 2005–06 marketing year began on August 1, 2005, and the marketing order requires that the rate of assessment for each year apply to all assessable walnuts handled during the year; (2) the Board needs to have sufficient funds to pay its expenses which are incurred on a continuous basis and; (3) handlers are aware of this action which was unanimously recommended by the Board at a public meeting and is similar to other assessment rate actions issued in past years.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 984

Walnuts, Marketing agreements, Nuts, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 984 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 984—WALNUTS GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 984 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

2. Section 984.347 is revised to read as follows:

§ 984.347 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 2005, an assessment rate of $0.0096 per kernelweight pound is established for California merchantable walnuts.

Dated: October 31, 2005.

Lloyd C. Day,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 05–22047 Filed 11–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 63

RIN 3150–AH68

Implementation of a Dose Standard After 10,000 Years; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On September 8, 2005 (70 FR 53313), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published for public comment a proposed rule that would

amend its regulations governing the disposal of high-level radioactive wastes in a proposed geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. The proposed rule would implement the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) proposed standards for doses that could occur after 10,000 years but within the period of geologic stability. The comment period for EPA's proposed standards currently expires on November 21, 2005 (extended 30 days from October 21, 2005); the comment period for NRC's proposed rule currently expires on November 7, 2005.

A letter was received from U.S. Senators Harry Reid and John Ensign from the State of Nevada requesting that the comment period for NRC's proposed rule be extended to a total of 180 days, or at least past the date of EPA's 30-day extension. Another letter representing several citizen and environmental groups requested that the deadline for comments be extended to 180 days. In addition, a letter from the Agency for Nuclear Projects, on behalf of the State of Nevada, requested that NRC extend its comment period for an additional 30 days, consistent with EPA's 30-day extension of its comment period.

Given the interrelationship between these two proposed rules, and for consistency with the ongoing EPA rulemaking process, NRC has decided to extend the comment period for its rulemaking an additional 30 days to December 7, 2005, for a total comment period of 90 days. In vacating the compliance period in NRC's rule at 10 CFR part 63, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has made clear that it is ''NRC's obligation under the [Energy Policy Act of 1992] to maintain licensing criteria that are consistent with the public health and safety standards promulgated by EPA.'' See *Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc.* v. *EPA,* 373 F.3d 1251, 1299 (D.C. Cir. 2004). Thus NRC's proposed rule, for the most part, simply implements EPA's proposed standards for doses that could occur after 10,000 years but within the period of geologic stability, and its final rule will need to implement any changes EPA may make with respect to its standards. NRC's proposed rule provides further detail for implementing the EPA standard in only two specific areas: A value to represent climate change after 10,000 years; and a requirement that calculations of radiation doses for workers use the same weighting factors that EPA is proposing for calculating individual doses to members of the public. A lengthy period of time should not be needed by potential commenters to address these issues. Hence the NRC's 30-day extension is believed to be appropriate.

DATES: The comment period has been extended and now expires on December 7, 2005. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but NRC is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any one of the following methods. Please include the following number (RIN 3150–AH68) in the subject line of your comments. Comments on rulemakings submitted in writing or in electronic form will be made available to the public in their entirety on the NRC rulemaking Web site. Personal information will not be removed from your comments.

Mail comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attn: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

E-mail comments to: *SECY@nrc.gov.* If you do not receive a reply e-mail confirming that we have received your comments, contact us directly at (301) 415–1966. You may also submit comments via the NRC's rulemaking Web site at *http://ruleforum.llnl.gov.* Address questions about our rulemaking Web site to Carol Gallagher (301) 415–5905; e-mail *cag@nrc.gov.* Comments can also be submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Hand deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. (Telephone (301) 415–1966.)

Fax comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission at (301) 415–1101.

Publicly available documents related to this rulemaking may be examined and copied for a fee at the NRC's Public Document Room, Public File Area O1 F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. Selected documents, including comments, can be viewed and downloaded electronically via the NRC rulemaking Web site at *http://ruleforum.llnl.gov.*

Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC after November 1, 1999, are available electronically at the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html.* From this site, the public can gain entry into the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, (301) 415–4737, or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Timothy McCartin, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–7285, e-mail *tjm3@nrc.gov;* Janet Kotra, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–6674, e-mail *jpk@nrc.gov;* or Frank Cardile, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–6185, e-mail *fpc@nrc.gov.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of November, 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Luis A. Reyes,

Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 05–22121 Filed 11–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2005–22364; Directorate Identifier 2005–NE–26–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 1B, 1D and 1D1 Turboshaft Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Turbomeca Arriel 1B, 1D and 1D1 turboshaft engines. This proposed AD would require inspecting the 2nd stage nozzle guide vanes (NGV2) for wall thickness. This proposed AD results from one instance of a fractured 2nd stage turbine blade followed by an uncommanded engine shutdown. We are proposing this AD to detect and prevent perforation of the NGV2 that could cause fracture of a turbine blade that could result in an uncommanded engine in-flight shutdown.

DATES: We must receive any comments on this proposed AD by January 3, 2006.