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]

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