

another scenario without volume regulation. If volume regulation were to be implemented, the assessment rate would remain at \$7.50 per ton. If volume regulation were not to be implemented, some costs typically allocated to a reserve pool budget would be absorbed by the administrative budget, thus necessitating an increased assessment rate to \$14.00 per ton. The committee unanimously approved these alternative budget and assessment recommendations on July 22, 2010.

The committee met again on October 5, 2010, and determined that volume regulation was not warranted for the 2010–11 season. This triggered recommendation of the committee's proposal for an administrative budget of \$4,628,960 and an assessment rate of \$14.00 per ton, since the current assessment rate of \$7.50 would not provide enough funds to cover anticipated expenses of \$4,423,500.

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 minimum grower price of \$1,500 per ton of raisins for the 2010–11 crop year has been announced by the Raisin Bargaining Association. If this price is realized, assessment revenue would continue to represent less than one percent of grower revenue in the 2010–11 crop year, even with the increased assessment rate.

Regarding the impact of this action on affected entities, this action would increase the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While increased assessments impose additional costs on handlers regulated under the order, the rates are uniform on all handlers, and proportional to the size of their businesses. However, these costs would be offset by the benefits derived by the operation of the marketing order.

In addition, the Audit Subcommittee and the full committee's meetings were widely publicized throughout the California raisin industry and all interested persons were invited to attend the meetings and encouraged to participate in committee deliberations on all issues. Like all subcommittee and committee meetings, the July 22 and October 5, 2010, meetings were public meetings, and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue, if they chose to do so. Based upon the discussions and the unanimous vote by the committee, the increased assessment is reasonable and necessary to maintain the program. Finally, interested persons are invited to submit comments on this proposed rule, including 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 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 sector agencies.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

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/MarketingOrdersSmallBusinessGuide>. Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Antoinette Carter 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 2010–11 crop year began on August 1, 2010, and the order requires the rate of assessments for each crop year to apply to all assessable raisins handled during the crop year; (2) the committee 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 committee at a public meeting.

#### List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 989

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

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 989 is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### **PART 989—RAISINS PRODUCED FROM GRAPES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA**

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 989 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

2. Section 989.347 is revised to read as follows:

#### **§ 989.347 Assessment rate.**

On and after August 1, 2010, an assessment rate of \$14.00 per ton is established for assessable raisins

produced from grapes grown in California.

Dated: January 19, 2011.

**Rayne Pegg,**

*Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[FR Doc. 2011–1427 Filed 1–24–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–02–P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

### **10 CFR Part 835**

[Docket No. HS–RM–09–835]

RIN 1901–AA–95

#### **Occupational Radiation Protection; Revision**

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule and opportunity for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) proposes to revise the values in an appendix to its Occupational Radiation Protection requirements. The derived air concentration values for air immersion are calculated using several parameters. One of these, exposure time, is better represented by the hours in the workday, rather than the hours in a calendar day, and is therefore used in the revised calculations.

**DATES:** Public comments on the proposed revisions must be received on or before February 24, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. HS–RM–09–835 and/or RIN 1901–AA–95, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *E-mail:* [Judy.Foulke@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Judy.Foulke@hq.doe.gov). Include Docket Number HS–RM–09–835 and/or RIN 1901–AA–95 in the subject line of the message.

- *Mail:* Dr. Judith D. Foulke, Office of Worker Safety and Health Policy (HS–11), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Judith Foulke, (301) 903–5865, *e-mail:* [Judy.Foulke@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Judy.Foulke@hq.doe.gov).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

The requirements in title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, part 835 (10 CFR part 835), *Occupational Radiation Protection*, are designed to protect the health and safety of workers at DOE facilities. One situation that must be addressed is the exposure of workers to radioactive material dispersed in the air.

Based on calculations involving doses to the organs of the body, levels of contamination in the air that will not cause the dose limits for workers to be exceeded are established for specified radionuclides. These values are given in appendix C.

DOE first published, a final rule on December 14, 1993, (58 FR 65485), amending 10 CFR part 835. In the June 8, 2007, (72 FR 31903) amendment to part 835, DOE revised the values in appendix C to part 835, *Derived Air Concentration (DAC) for Workers from External Exposure during Immersion in a Cloud of Airborne Radioactive Material*. The calculations done for the 2007 amendment were based on a 24-hour day. However, to be consistent with other occupational exposure scenarios, such as those used in developing the appendix A DACs, an 8-hour per day exposure scenario is more reasonable.

**Need for Revisions**

This proposed rule revises the values in appendix C to part 835, *Derived Air Concentration (DAC) for Workers from External Exposure during Immersion in a Cloud of Airborne Radioactive Material*.

**List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 835**

Federal buildings and facilities, Nuclear energy, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Nuclear safety, Occupational safety and health, Radiation protection, and Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 11, 2011.

**Glenn S. Podonsky,**  
*Chief Health, Safety and Security Officer,*  
*Office of Health, Safety and Security.*

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the preamble, part 835 of Chapter III

of 10 CFR is proposed to be amended as set forth below:

**PART 835—OCCUPATIONAL RADIATION PROTECTION**

1. The authority citation for part 835 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 2201, 7191; 50 U.S.C. 2410.

2. Amend appendix C to part 835, by revising the table to read as follows:

**Appendix C to Part 835—Derived Air Concentration (DAC) for Workers From External Exposure During Immersion in a Cloud of Airborne Radioactive Material**

\* \* \* \* \*

**AIR IMMERSION DAC**

Radionuclide	Half-Life	( $\mu\text{Ci/mL}$ )	( $\text{Bq/m}^3$ )
Ar-37	35.02 d	3E+00	1E+11
Ar-39	269 yr	1E-03	5E+07
Ar-41	1.827 h	3E-06	1E+05
Kr-74	11.5 min	3E-06	1E+05
Kr-76	14.8 h	1E-05	3E+05
Kr-77	74.7 h	4E-06	1E+05
Kr-79	35.04 h	1E-05	6E+05
Kr-81	2.1E+05 yr	7E-04	2E+07
Kr-83m	1.83 h	7E-02	2E+09
Kr-85	10.72 yr	7E-04	2E+07
Kr-85m	4.48 h	2E-05	1E+06
Kr-87	76.3 min	4E-06	1E+05
Kr-88	2.84 h	1E-06	7E+04
Xe-120	40.0 min	1E-05	4E+05
Xe-121	40.1 min	2E-06	8E+04
Xe-122	20.1 h	8E-05	3E+06
Xe-123	2.14 h	6E-06	2E+05
Xe-125	16.8 h	1E-05	6E+05
Xe-127	36.406 d	1E-05	6E+05
Xe-129m	8.89 d	2E-04	7E+06
Xe-131m	11.84 d	5E-04	1E+07
Xe-133	5.245 d	1E-04	5E+06
Xe-133m	2.19 d	1E-04	5E+06
Xe-135	9.11 h	1E-05	6E+05
Xe-135m	15.36 min	1E-05	3E+05
Xe-138	14.13 min	3E-06	1E+05

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2011-1500 Filed 1-24-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. FAA-2011-0030; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-183-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

**Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A310 Series Airplanes, and Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Series Airplanes)**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above that would supersede three existing ADs. This proposed AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

The airworthiness limitations applicable to the Damage Tolerant Airworthiness Limitation Items (DT ALI) are currently listed in Airbus ALI Documents, which are referenced in the A300, A310, and A300-600 Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS) Part 2. Airbus has recently revised the ALI Documents, which have been approved by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA).

\* \* \* \* \*

The actions contained in these revised documents, which introduce more restrictive maintenance requirements and/or airworthiness limitations, have been identified as mandatory actions for continued airworthiness. \* \* \*

The unsafe condition is fatigue cracking, damage, or corrosion in principal structural elements, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane. The proposed AD would require actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

**DATES:** We must receive comments on this proposed AD by March 11, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Fax:* (202) 493-2251.

- *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room

W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-40, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact Airbus SAS—EAW (Airworthiness Office), 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 5 61 93 36 96; fax +33 5 61 93 44 51; e-mail [account.airworth-eas@airbus.com](mailto:account.airworth-eas@airbus.com); Internet <http://www.airbus.com>. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425-227-1221.

**Examining the AD Docket**

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>; or in person at the Docket Operations office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone (800) 647-5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dan Rodina, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98057-3356; telephone (425) 227-2125; fax (425) 227-1149.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Comments Invited**

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include “Docket No. FAA-2011-0030; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-183-AD” at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD based on those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We

will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

**Discussion**

On February 6, 2007, we issued AD 2007-04-11, Amendment 39-14943 (72 FR 8604, February 27, 2007). That AD required actions intended to address an unsafe condition on Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 series airplanes.

On September 19, 2007, we issued AD 2007-20-03, Amendment 39-15213 (72 FR 54536, September 26, 2007). That AD required actions intended to address an unsafe condition on Airbus Model A300-600 series airplanes.

On November 23, 2007, we issued AD 2007-25-02, Amendment 39-15283 (72 FR 69612, December 10, 2007). That AD required actions intended to address an unsafe condition on Airbus Model A310 series airplanes.

Since we issued ADs 2007-04-11, 2007-20-03, and 2007-25-02, we have determined that the airworthiness limitations for these airplanes must be updated in order to adequately address the unsafe condition. The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Community, has issued EASA Airworthiness Directive 2009-0155, dated July 17, 2009 (referred to after this as “the MCAI”), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

The airworthiness limitations applicable to the Damage Tolerant Airworthiness Limitation Items (DT ALI) are currently listed in Airbus ALI Documents, which are referenced in the A300, A310, and A300-600 Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS) Part 2. Airbus has recently revised the ALI Documents, which have been approved by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA).

—Airbus A300 ALI Document issue 04.

—Airbus A310 ALI Document issue 07 and

—Airbus A300-600 ALI Document issue 12

The actions contained in these revised documents, which introduce more restrictive maintenance requirements and/or airworthiness limitations, have been identified as mandatory actions for continued airworthiness. EASA issued ADs 2006-0071, 2006-0260, and 2006-0374 [which correspond to FAA ADs 2007-04-11, 2007-25-02, and 2007-20-03] to require compliance with the maintenance requirements and associated airworthiness limitations defined in previous issues of these Airbus ALI documents.

For the reason described above, [the] EASA AD supersedes existing ADs 2006-0071, 2006-0260, and 2006-0374 and requires an update to the approved aircraft maintenance