

storage, who should have access to such information, and how should access be provided? Note that changes to the EWR and/or disclosure of such information may require amendments to 7 CFR part 735 or the Electronic Provider Agreements for cotton, or both.

8. As a condition of loan eligibility, should loan applicants be required to agree that CCC may disclose such storage information to potential cotton buyers?

9. If CCC provides a loan for upland cotton identified on the EWR as stored outside, should the loan rate be provided at the national average loan rate? Additionally, should the loan settlement for any upland loan cotton, that is stored outside and subsequently forfeited to CCC, be based on classification information provided by the producer after the cotton has been delivered to CCC inside an approved cotton storage warehouse? If so, should the additional costs of providing this classification information be paid by the producer or by CCC, and why?

10. Non-loan upland cotton stored outside at warehouses is not subject to CCC storage requirements. Are there any storage and handling practices commonly used by warehouses for outside storage that protect the cotton and all interested parties and that could be adopted for outside stored upland loan cotton, such as double bagging? If so, are there geographic, marketing, or other constraints to such practices?

11. Are there circumstances under which CCC should increase or decrease the weekly minimum shipping standard of 4.5 percent? If so, explain how CCC might administer any different standard. Is there a need for CCC to strengthen enforcement of the current standard, and if so, by what methods? Should CCC rules be changed to reflect 4.5 percent of total stocks rather than approved capacity?

12. In the past, CCC has at times re-concentrated loan cotton only for the purpose of protecting the interest of the producer or CCC. Merchants having options to purchase loan cotton may benefit from re-concentrating loan cotton for marketing efficiencies. Should CCC allow producers, or agents of producers, to request re-concentration of loan cotton for any reason? If so, would the producer/producer's agent be willing to pay for the charges associated with such re-concentration? Should they be required to pay such charges in all instances? Define circumstances, if any, when CCC should pay re-concentration charges.

Signed at Washington, DC February 6, 2006.

Thomas B. Hofeller,

*Acting Administrator, Farm Service Agency,
and Acting Executive Vice President,
Commodity Credit Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 06-1284 Filed 2-10-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-05-P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

12 CFR Parts 652 and 655

RIN 3052-AC17

Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Disclosure and Reporting Requirements; Risk-Based Capital Requirements

ACTION: Proposed rule; comment period extension.

SUMMARY: The Farm Credit Administration (FCA) Board extends the comment period on the proposed rule that would revise risk-based capital requirements for the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation (Farmer Mac or Corporation) to April 17, 2006, so that interested parties will have additional time to provide comments.

DATES: Please send your comments to us on or before April 17, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail or deliver comments to Robert Coleman, Director, Office of Secondary Market Oversight, Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090, or send them by facsimile transmission to (703) 883-4477. You may also submit your comments by electronic mail to reg-comm@fca.gov, or through the Pending Regulations section of our Web site at <http://www.fca.gov>, or through the Government-wide Web site <http://www.regulations.gov>.

You may review copies of comments we receive at our office in McLean, Virginia, or from our Web site at <http://www.fca.gov>. Once you are in the Web site, select "Legal Info," and then select "Public Comments." We will show your comments as submitted, but for technical reasons we may omit items such as logos and special characters. Identifying information you provide, such as phone numbers and addresses, will be publicly available. However, we will attempt to remove electronic-mail addresses to help reduce Internet spam.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joseph T. Connor, Associate Director for Policy and Analysis, Office of Secondary Market Oversight, Farm

Credit Administration, McLean, VA 22102-5090, (703) 883-4280, TTY (703) 883-4434; or Rebecca S. Orlich, Senior Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Farm Credit Administration, McLean, VA 22102-5090, (703) 883-4020, TDY (703) 883-4020.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 17, 2005, FCA published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** to amend regulations in parts 652 and 655 that establish a risk-based capital stress test for the Corporation as required by section 8.32 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended (12 U.S.C. 2279bb-1). See 70 FR 69692, November 17, 2005. The comment period is scheduled to expire on February 15, 2006. Farmer Mac has requested us to extend the comment period for at least an additional 60 days. In response to this request, we are extending the comment period until April 17, 2006. The FCA supports public involvement and participation in its regulatory process and invites all interested parties to review and provide comments on the proposed rule.

Dated: February 7, 2006.

Roland E. Smith,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. E6-1959 Filed 2-10-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2006-23873; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-110-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F Series Airplanes

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

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to supersede an existing airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to certain Boeing Model 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F series airplanes. The existing AD currently requires reviewing airplane maintenance records; inspecting the yaw damper actuator portion of the upper and lower rudder power control modules (PCM) for cracking, and replacing the PCMs if necessary; and reporting all airplane