Because the 2004–05 administrative budget funded some of the costs typically allocated to a reserve budget, the Committee's 2004–05 expenses were higher than normal. A comparison of 2005–06 recommended administrative budget expenditures to 2004–05 administrative budget expenditures follows: 2005–06 salaries, $500,000 (2004–05 administrative budgeted expenditures for salaries was $1,000,000); $686,000 for export program activities, ($536,000); $250,000 for compliance activities, ($320,000); $65,000 for group health insurance, ($150,000); $58,000 for rent, ($110,000); $60,000 for Committee member and staff travel, ($120,000); and $30,000 for computer software and programming, ($110,000).

The industry considered an alternative assessment rate and budget prior to arriving at the $7.50 per ton and $2,062,500 administrative budget recommendation. The Committee's Audit Subcommittee met on July 13, 2005, to review preliminary budget information. The subcommittee was aware that 2005–06 crop may be short and no volume regulation may be implemented. The subcommittee, thus, developed two budgets and assessment rates to accommodate a scenario with volume regulation and another scenario with no volume regulation. If volume regulation was not applicable, costs typically allocated to a reserve pool budget would be funded by the administrative budget, thus necessitating a continuation of the $11.00 per ton assessment rate. If volume regulation was applicable, costs would be allocated to an administrative budget and a reserve pool budget and the assessment rate would be reduced to $7.50 per ton. The Committee approved these budget and assessment recommendations on August 15, 2005. Ultimately, the Committee determined that volume regulation was applicable for the 2005–06 crop, and that the lower assessment rate of $7.50 per ton was appropriate.

A review of statistical data on the California raisin industry indicates that assessment revenue has consistently been less than one percent of grower revenue in recent years. A grower price of $1,210 per ton for the 2005–06 raisin crop has been announced by the Raisin Bargaining Association. If this price is realized, assessment revenue would continue to be less than one percent of grower revenue in the 2005–06 crop year, even with the reduced assessment rate.

Regarding the impact of this action on affected entities, this action continues in effect the action that decreased the assessment rate imposed on handlers. Assessments are applied uniformly on all handlers, and some of the costs may be passed on to producers. However, decreasing the assessment rate reduces the burden on handlers, and may reduce the burden on producers.

Additionally, the Audit Subcommittee's meeting on July 13, 2005, and the Committee's meeting on August 15, 2005, where this action was deliberated were public meetings widely publicized throughout the California raisin industry. All interested persons were invited to attend the meetings and participate in the Committee deliberations on all issues.

This action imposes no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large raisin handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sectors agencies.

USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

An interim final rule concerning this action was published in the **Federal Register** on February 22, 2006 (71 FR 8923). Copies of that rule were also mailed or sent via facsimile to all raisin handlers. Finally, the interim final rule was made available through the Internet by USDA and the Office of the Federal Register. A 60-day comment period was provided for interested persons to respond to the interim final rule. The comment period ended on April 24, 2006, and no comments were received.

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.

After consideration of all relevant material presented, including the information and recommendation submitted by the Committee and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 989

Grapes, Marketing agreements, Raisins, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

PART 989—RAISINS PRODUCED FROM GRAPES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

■ Accordingly, the interim final rule amending 7 CFR part 989 which was published at 71 FR 8923 on February 22, 2006, is adopted as a final rule without change.

Dated: May 23, 2006.

Lloyd C. Day,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. E6–8207 Filed 5–26–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 72

RIN 3150–AH87

List of Approved Fuel Storage Casks: VSC–24 Revision 6, Confirmation of Effective Date

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Direct final rule: Confirmation of effective date.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is confirming the effective date of June 5, 2006, for the direct final rule that was published in the **Federal Register** on March 21, 2006 (71 FR 14089). This direct final rule amended the NRC's regulations to revise the BNG Fuel Solutions Corporation VSC–24 cask system listing to include Amendment No. 6 to Certificate of Compliance (CoC) No. 1007.

DATES: *Effective Date:* The effective date of June 5, 2006, is confirmed for this direct final rule.

ADDRESSES: Documents related to this rulemaking, including comments received, may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. These same documents may also be viewed and downloaded electronically via the rulemaking Web site (*http://ruleforum.llnl.gov*). For information about the interactive rulemaking Web site, contact Ms. Carol Gallagher (301) 415–5905; e-mail *CAG@nrc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jayne M. McCausland, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301) 415–6219, e-mail *jmm2@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 21, 2006 (71 FR 14089), the NRC

published a direct final rule amending its regulations in 10 CFR part 72 to revise the BNG Fuel Solutions VSC–24 cask system listing within the ''List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks'' to include Amendment No. 6 to CoC No. 1007. This amendment revises the Technical Specifications related to periodic monitoring during storage operations and updates editorial changes associated with the company name change from BNFL Fuel Solutions Corporation to BNG Fuel Solutions Corporation. In the direct final rule, NRC stated that if no significant adverse comments were received, the direct final rule would become final on June 5, 2006. The NRC did not receive any comments that warranted withdrawal of the direct final rule. Therefore, this rule will become effective as scheduled.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of May, 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael T. Lesar,

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–8273 Filed 5–26–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

12 CFR Part 226

Truth in Lending (Regulation Z)

CFR Correction

In Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 220 to 299, revised as of January 1, 2006, on page 284, in § 226.7, the last sentence of paragraph (f) is corrected to read as follows:

§ 226.7 Periodic statement.

* * * * *

(f) * * * If there is more than one periodic rate, the amount of the finance charge attributable to each rate need not be separately itemized and identified.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 06–55519 Filed 5–26–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 23

Airworthiness Standards: Normal, Utility, Acrobatic, and Commuter Category Airplanes

CFR Correction

In Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1 to 59, revised as of January 1, 2006, on page 312, in § 23.1511, remove paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii).

[FR Doc. 06–55518 Filed 5–26–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2006–24897; Directorate Identifier 2006–NM–111–AD; Amendment 39–14619; AD 2006–11–15]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170–100 LR, –100 STD, –100 SE, and –100 SU Airplanes; and Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 190–100 LR, –100 STD, and –100 IGW Airplanes

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

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all EMBRAER Model ERJ 170 and Model ERJ 190 airplanes. This AD requires revising the Limitations section of the airplane flight manual to prohibit the flightcrew from moving the throttle into the forward thrust range immediately after applying the thrust reverser. This AD results from a report that, during landing, the thrust reverser may not re-stow completely if the throttle lever is moved into the forward thrust range immediately after the thrust reverser is applied. We are issuing this AD to prevent the flightcrew from performing a takeoff with a partially deployed thrust reverser, which could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: This AD becomes effective June 14, 2006.

We must receive comments on this AD by July 31, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following addresses to submit comments on this AD.

- DOT Docket Web site: Go to *http://dms.dot.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- Government-wide rulemaking Web site: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590.
- Fax: (202) 493–2251.
- Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif

Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Thompson, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227-1175; fax (425) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Discussion

The Departamento de Aviacao Civil (DAC), which is the airworthiness authority for Brazil, notified us that an unsafe condition may exist on all EMBRAER Model ERJ 170 and Model ERJ 190 airplanes. The DAC advises that, during landing, the thrust reverser may not re-stow completely if the throttle lever is moved into the forward thrust range immediately (that is, within 0.2 seconds) after the thrust reverser is applied. If the flightcrew subsequently performs a takeoff, the airplane may become airborne with a partially deployed thrust reverser. This condition, if not corrected, could result in reduced controllability of the airplane. The DAC issued Brazilian airworthiness directives 2006–03–02, effective April 21, 2006 (for all Model ERJ 170 airplanes); and 2006–03–03, effective April 21, 2006 (for all Model ERJ 190 airplanes), to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in Brazil.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This AD

These airplane models are manufactured in Brazil and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. We have examined the DAC's findings, evaluated all pertinent information, and determined that we need to issue an AD for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States. Therefore, we are issuing this AD to prevent the flightcrew from performing a takeoff with a partially deployed thrust reverser, which could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.