

operations when combined with other income. In addition, the crop estimate for the 2018–19 crop year is expected to be 29,000,000 pounds, compared to 36,000,000 pounds for the 2017–18 crop year.

The income generated from the proposed higher assessment rate applied to the estimated crop, combined with carry-in funds from the 2017–18 crop year and income from other sources, should be sufficient to cover anticipated 2018–19 expenses and to maintain a financial reserve within the limit specified by the Order.

Section 987.72(d) states that the Committee may maintain an operating monetary reserve not to exceed the average of one year's expenses incurred during the most recent five preceding crop years, except that an established reserve need not be reduced to conform to any recomputed average. The Committee estimated a \$50,000 reserve carry-in for the 2018–19 crop year. It expects to utilize \$35,290 of the reserve during the year, leaving a reserve of approximately \$14,710 at the end of the 2018–19 crop year, which is within the limit specified in the Order.

The Committee reviewed and unanimously recommended 2018–19 crop year expenditures of \$83,790. Prior to arriving at this budget, the Committee considered information from its Budget Subcommittee (Subcommittee), which met on June 7, 2018. The Subcommittee discussed alternative expenditure levels and assessment rates, including not changing the assessment rate or adjusting expenses. Ultimately, the Subcommittee and the Committee recommended an assessment rate of \$0.15 per hundredweight of dates handled after considering several factors including the anticipated 2018–19 crop, the Committee's estimated 2018–19 reserve carry-in and other income, and its anticipated expenses.

A review of historical and preliminary information pertaining to the upcoming crop year indicates that the producer price for the 2017–18 crop year was approximately \$142.00 per hundredweight of dates. Utilizing that price, the estimated crop size, and the proposed assessment rate of \$0.15 per hundredweight, the estimated assessment revenue for the 2018–19 crop year as a percentage of total producer revenue will be approximately 0.1 percent (\$0.15 per hundredweight divided by \$142 per hundredweight).

This proposed 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 Order. In addition, the Committee's and the Subcommittee's meetings were widely publicized throughout the California date industry. All interested persons were invited to attend the meetings and encouraged to participate in Committee deliberations on all issues. Like all Committee meetings, the June 28, 2018, meeting was a public meeting, and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue. Interested persons are invited to submit comments on this proposed rule, including the regulatory and information collection impacts of this action on small businesses.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the Order's information collection requirements have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB No. 0581–0178 Vegetable and Specialty Crops. No changes in those requirements would be necessary as a result of this action. Should any changes become necessary, they would be submitted to OMB for approval.

This proposed rule would not impose any additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large California date 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 proposed 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/rules-regulations/moa/small-businesses>. Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Richard Lower at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

#### 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, CALIFORNIA

■ 1. The authority citation for part 987 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. Section 987.339 is revised to read as follows:

### § 987.339 Assessment rate.

On and after October 1, 2018, an assessment rate of \$0.15 per hundredweight is established for dates produced or packed in Riverside County, California.

Dated: October 29, 2018.

**Bruce Summers,**

*Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[FR Doc. 2018–23917 Filed 11–1–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–02–P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### 10 CFR Parts 170 and 171

[Docket No. PRM–170–7; NRC–2018–0172]

#### Categorization of the Licensee Fee Category for Full-Cost Recovery

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Petition for rulemaking; notice of docketing.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has received a petition for rulemaking (PRM) from Mr. Christopher S. Pugsley, Esq. (the petitioner), on behalf of Water Remediation Technology (WRT), LLC, dated July 3, 2018, requesting that the NRC amend its regulations regarding full-cost recovery of licensee fees. The petition was docketed by the NRC on August 2, 2018, and has been assigned Docket No. PRM–170–7. The NRC is examining the issues raised in PRM–170–7 to determine whether they should be considered in rulemaking. The NRC is not instituting a public comment period for this PRM as the staff anticipates considering the issues raised in the petition in the upcoming fiscal year 2019 proposed fee rule, and the public will have an opportunity to comment at that time.

**DATES:** The PRM is available on November 2, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2018–0172 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this petition. You may obtain publicly-available information

related to this petition by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Website*: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0172. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS)*: You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in this document. The petition, PRM-170-7, is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18214A757.

- *NRC's PDR*: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Renu Suri, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-0161, email: [Renu.Suri@nrc.gov](mailto:Renu.Suri@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. The Petitioner**

Mr. Christopher S. Pugsley, Esq. (the petitioner) submitted this petition on behalf of WRT, requesting that the NRC amend its regulations to re-categorize licensees performing water treatment services from a full-cost recovery category to a category with a fixed annual fee.

**II. The Petition**

The petitioner is requesting that the NRC revise parts 170 and 171 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) to re-categorize WRT as a licensee that does not require full-cost recovery for fees billed to it during the life of its license, address consistency issues between 10 CFR parts 170 and 171 for small entities, and extend the timeframe in which a request for a fee exemption must be submitted under § 170.11. The

petitioner also requests that the rule change be actively considered in the NRC's fiscal year 2019 rulemaking for its fee regulations.

**III. Discussion of the Petition**

The petitioner requests that the NRC amend its regulations to re-categorize WRT as a licensee that does not require full-cost recovery for fees billed to it during the life of its license under 10 CFR part 170, address consistency issues between 10 CFR parts 170 and 171 for small entities, and consider this rule change during the FY 2019 revision of the fee rule. The petitioner assists small community water systems with compliance with the uranium drinking water standard: "WRT's license operations are not intended to process source material for its commercial value thereby reducing the financial benefit to the licensee as compared to uranium recovery facilities that process ores primarily for their source material content." The petitioner suggests that the NRC should further ease the financial burden on community water systems so that they may comply with the uranium drinking water standard. The petitioner also notes NRC actions that seem to agree with his recommendation.

The petitioner also requests additional conforming and related changes. The petitioner asserts that the NRC should consider addressing consistency issues between 10 CFR parts 170 and 171 fees for uranium water treatment licensees that are recognized by the NRC as small entities. The petitioner also requested that the NRC consider amending language under § 170.11 to extend the time within which a licensee may appeal the assessment of fees and apply for a fee exemption. The petitioner notes that NRC could approve the petition as an alternative to revising the NRC's fee recovery requirements during the next revision of the annual fee rule.

**IV. Conclusion**

The NRC will examine the issues raised in PRM-170-7 to determine whether they should be considered in rulemaking.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of October, 2018.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Annette L. Vietti-Cook**,  
*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2018-24002 Filed 11-1-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

**FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY**

**12 CFR Part 1281**

**RIN 2590-AA82**

**Federal Home Loan Bank Housing Goals Amendments**

**AGENCY:** Federal Housing Finance Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) is proposing to amend the existing Federal Home Loan Bank Housing Goals regulation. FHFA proposes to replace the existing four separate retrospective housing goals with a single prospective mortgage purchase housing goal as well as establish a separate small member participation housing goal. The proposed rule would also allow the Banks to request FHFA approval of alternative target levels for the proposed goals. Finally, FHFA is proposing to eliminate the existing \$2.5 billion volume threshold that triggers the application of housing goals for each Bank.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before January 31, 2019.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit your comments, identified by regulatory information number (RIN) 2590-AA82, by any of the following methods:

- *Agency website*: [www.fhfa.gov/open-for-comment-or-input](http://www.fhfa.gov/open-for-comment-or-input).
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal*: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. If you submit your comment to the *Federal eRulemaking Portal*, please also send it by email to FHFA at [RegComments@fhfa.gov](mailto:RegComments@fhfa.gov) to ensure timely receipt by FHFA. Please include "Comments/RIN 2590-AA82" in the subject line of the submission.

- *Hand Delivered/Courier*: The hand delivery address is: Alfred M. Pollard, General Counsel, Attention: Comments/RIN 2590-AA82, Federal Housing Finance Agency, Eighth Floor, 400 7th Street SW, Washington, DC 20219. The package should be delivered at the 7th Street entrance Guard Desk, First Floor, on business days between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

- *U.S. Mail, United Parcel Service, Federal Express, or Other Mail Service*: The mailing address for comments is: Alfred M. Pollard, General Counsel, Attention: Comments/RIN 2590-AA82, Federal Housing Finance Agency, Eighth Floor, 400 7th Street SW, Washington, DC 20219. Please note that all mail sent to FHFA via U.S. Mail is