

interpretation of the rule is, in terms of safety, the most desired approach. The petitioner states that the recommended language that amends § 34.51 puts the access control responsibility with the radiographer, but allows him the latitude to use additional personnel to control radiographic operations if needed. The petitioner believes that this additional personnel may include persons not qualified as a radiographer or radiographer's assistant, but capable of providing needed support to control access to the restricted area while remaining at the perimeter of the restricted area. The petitioner believes that, as the rule recommends, the rule does not require two persons to constantly monitor operations, nor does it limit it to two persons. The petitioner believes that the rule allows the radiographer in charge to make that decision. The petitioner states there is no justification for imposing additional costs and negative impact on an industry that has not demonstrated performance that would warrant this cost and impact.

The petitioner states that to assess the additional cost of implementing the two-person crew as the NRC does, Texas contacted several of its licensees who have both Texas and NRC licenses. The petitioner states that the cost of an additional person would be a minimum of \$200 per day (including travel and per diem). The cost of additional time would be \$10–12 per hour (not including overtime pay). The petitioner states that the licensees contacted indicated that an even greater impact of enforcing the two-person crew as the NRC does, would be the lack of availability of industrial radiographic personnel to do the work. The petitioner states that the licensees indicated that not only are there not enough certified radiographers to do the amount of work the companies had at that time (one licensee indicated that an average work week is 65 hours), there is a shortage of people interested in obtaining the training and becoming certified.

Conclusion

The petitioner states that, while the OAS agrees with a requirement for a two-person radiography crew at temporary job sites, the organization disagrees with NRC's prescriptive interpretation of the requirements for a two-person crew, the apparent conflict between NRC's surveillance requirement and two-person crew requirement, and NRC's omission of a radiation safety training requirement prior to an individual using sources of radiation.

The petitioner believes that while it was encouraging that the NRC adopted requirements in 1997 similar to those that had previously been adopted by many States, it is disheartening that the NRC industrial radiography requirements in 10 CFR part 34 do not address one of the primary factors identified as a root cause of a large number of industrial radiographer over exposures. The petitioner states that the failure to require safety training before using sources of radiation is failing to address one of the root causes of industrial radiography incidents. The petitioner states that current NRC requirements allow a radiographer assistant to use sources of radiation without attending a safety course that addresses the basic radiation topics outlined in rule. The petitioner believes that it is possible for an individual to work for years as a radiographer assistant and never receive radiation safety training. The petitioner states that the NRC regulations merely require that the assistant pass a written exam on the regulation, license, and the licensee's operating and emergency procedures and pass a practical exam on the use of the radiographic equipment. Both written and practical exams are administered by the licensee. The petitioner believes that it is important to remember that not all radiography is conducted by the larger radiography companies who have the resources to establish and oversee adequate and often exemplary training programs. The petitioner states that in contrast to the NRC's minimum training requirements, many of the States' rules require that prior to using sources of radiation, an individual must complete a 40-hour safety course addressing radiation safety fundamentals specified in rule, in addition to passing a licensee-administered written exam on the rules, license conditions, and operating and emergency procedures and passing a licensee-administered practical exam on the use of the equipment. In many States this requirement applies equally to a radiographer's assistant. The petitioner believes it is critical for an individual to receive radiation safety training prior to operating sources of radiation.

The petitioner states that the proposed actions will use risk-informed, performance based requirements to ensure safety of workers and the public, eliminate current compatibility discrepancies, provide uniformity in regulations nationwide, and ensure consistency in surveillance requirements. Accordingly, the petitioner requests that the NRC amend

its regulations concerning radiation safety training before using sources of radiation for industrial radiography, as previously discussed.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of December 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. E5–7974 Filed 12–27–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 25

[Policy Statement No. ANM–04–115–28]

Policy Statement With Request to an Unreliable Design of Seat Belt Attachment Fittings on Passenger Seats and Compliance With § 25.601

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed policy; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces the availability of proposed certification policy for compliance with 14 CFR 25.601 regarding an unreliable seat belt attachment fitting design installed on passenger seats.

DATES: Send your comments on or before January 27, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Address our comments to the individual identified under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jayson Claar, Federal Aviation Administration, Transport Airplane Directorate, Transport Standards Staff, Airframe and Cabin Safety Branch, ANM–115, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2194; fax (425) 227–1149; e-mail jayson.claar@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

The proposed policy is available on the Internet at the following address: <http://www.airweb.faa.gov/rgl>. If you do not have access to the Internet, you can obtain a copy of the policy by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

The FAA invites your comments on this proposed policy. We will accept our comments, data, views, or arguments by letter, fax, or e-mail. Send your comments to the person indicated in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Mark your comments, "Comments to Policy Statement No. ANM-04-115-28."

Use the following format when preparing your comments:

- Organize your comments issue-by-issue.
- For each issue, state what specific change you are requesting to the proposed policy.
- Include justification, reasons, or data for each change you are requesting.

We also welcome comments in support of the proposed policy.

We will consider all communications received on or before the closing date for comments. We may change the proposed policy because of the comments received.

Background

The proposed policy will provide Federal Aviation Administration certification policy for compliance with 14 CFR 25.601 regarding an unreliable design of seat belt attachment fitting installed on passenger seats. The FAA has determined that this particular design does not comply with § 25.601. This determination means that the FAA will not approve any additional installations of this design of seat belt attachment fittings on passenger seats.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on December 13, 2005.

Ali Bahrami,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 05-24501 Filed 12-27-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket FAA 05-22665; Airspace Docket 05-ANM-13]

Proposed Amendment to Class E Airspace; Jackson, WY

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This proposal would revise Class E airspace at Jackson, WY. Additional Class E airspace is necessary to accommodate aircraft using a new Localizer Performance with Vertical Guidance (LPV) approach procedure, with Lateral/Vertical Navigation (LNAV/VNAV) minimums. This action would improve the safety of Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) aircraft executing the new LPV approach procedure at Jackson Hole Airport, Jackson, WY.

DATES: Comments must be received by February 13, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on this proposal to the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. You must identify the docket number, FAA 05-22665; Airspace Docket 05-ANM-13, at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments through the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. You may review the public docket containing the proposal, any comments received, and any final dispositions in person in the Docket Office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Office (telephone number 1-800-647-5527) is on the plaza level of the Department of Transportation NASSIF Building at the above address.

An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Western En Route and Oceanic Service Area Office, Airspace Branch, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98055.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal.

Communications should identify Docket FAA 05-22665; Airspace Docket 05-ANM-13, and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this action must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the following statement: Comments to Docket FAA 05-22665; Airspace Docket 05-ANM-13. The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRM

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded through the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. Recently published rulemaking documents can also be accessed through the FAA's Web page at <http://www.faa.gov> or the Superintendent of Document's Web page at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara>.

Additionally, any person may obtain a copy of this notice by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Western En Route and Oceanic Service Area Office, Airspace Branch, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98055. Communications must identify both document numbers for this notice. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRMs should contact the FAA's Office of Rulemaking, 202-267-9677, to request a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11-2A, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Distribution System, which describes the application procedures.

The Proposal

This action would amend Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations, part 71 (14 CFR part 71) by revising Class E airspace at Jackson Hole Airport, Jackson, WY. Additional Class E controlled airspace is necessary to accommodate aircraft using a new LPV approach procedure with LNAV/VNAV minimums. This airspace revision would improve the safety of IFR aircraft executing the new LPV approach procedure at Jackson Hole Airport, Jackson, WY. Controlled airspace is necessary where there is a requirement for IFR services, which include arrival, departure, and transitioning to/from the terminal or en route environment. Class E airspace designations are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9N dated September 1, 2005, and effective September 15, 2005, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designation listed in this document will be published subsequently in this order.

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this proposed regulation: (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.