

Promotion Branch, FV, AMS, USDA, Room 2535-S, Stop 0244, Washington, DC 20250-0244; telephone (888) 720-9917 (toll free); or facsimile (202) 205-2800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposed rule was issued on May 26, 2000, and published in the **Federal Register** [65 FR 35298, June 2, 2000]. The proposed rule invited comments on adding a public member to the National Peanut Board (Board), allowing producers in minor peanut-producing states to conduct nominations by mail ballot, making changes related to the addition of the public member, and eliminating obsolete language. The Board is currently composed of 10 peanut producers and their alternates as required by the Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information (Order). The proposed rule specified that comments must be received by August 1, 2000.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) received requests from seven peanut producer organizations, and five Members of Congress to extend the comment period for 60 days. The organizations stated that the peanut industry is in the middle of the growing season and needs time to organize grower meetings in order to give their members the opportunity to discuss the positives and negatives of adding a public member to the Board. The congressional comments supported the organizations' request for an additional 60 days to submit comments. In addition, the Board submitted a comment on the proposed rule.

USDA also is concerned about the peanut industry and other interested persons having adequate time to review the proposed rule. Taking into account the requests received for additional time to comment, it is USDA's view that reopening the comment period for 30 days will allow peanut producers, producer organizations, and other interested persons adequate time to develop comments on the proposed rule and submit them. Further, the original comment period was for 60 days. The additional 30 days provides the industry a total of 90 days to comment on the proposal.

Accordingly, the period in which to file written comments is reopened until September 20, 2000.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7401-7425.

Dated: August 15, 2000.

Robert C. Keeney,

Deputy Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Programs.

[FR Doc. 00-21217 Filed 8-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Parts 1 and 2

[Docket No. 00-005-2]

Animal Welfare; Definitions for and Reporting of Pain and Distress

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: We are extending the comment period for our request for comments concerning several changes we are considering making to the Animal Welfare regulations to promote the humane treatment of live animals used in research, testing, and teaching and to improve the quality of information we report to Congress concerning animal pain and distress. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

DATES: We invite you to comment on Docket No. 00-005-1. We will consider all comments that we receive by November 7, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Please send your comment and three copies to: Docket No. 00-005-1, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Suite 3C03, 4700 River Road, Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238.

Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. 00-005-1.

You may read any comments that we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690-2817 before coming.

APHIS documents published in the **Federal Register**, and related information, including the names of organizations and individuals who have commented on APHIS dockets, are available on the Internet at <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/rad/webrepor.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Jodie Kulpa, Staff Veterinarian, AC, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 84, Riverdale, MD 20737-1234; (301) 734-7833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 10, 2000, we published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 42304-42305, Docket No. 00-005-1) a request for comments on several changes we are considering making to the Animal Welfare regulations to promote the humane treatment of live animals used in research, testing, and teaching and to improve the quality of information we report to Congress concerning animal pain and distress. Specifically, we are considering adding a definition for the term "distress" and replacing or modifying the system we use to classify animal pain and distress.

Comments in response to our request for comments were required to be received on or before September 8, 2000. In response to requests from the public, we are extending the comment period on Docket No. 00-005-1 for an additional 60 days. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2131-2159; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.7.

Done in Washington, DC, this 15th day of August 2000.

Bobby R. Acord,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 00-21173 Filed 8-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-NE-43-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Aerospace Propellers Model R381/6-123-F/5 Propellers

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document proposes to revise an existing airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Dowty Aerospace Propellers Model R381/6-123-F/5 propellers. That action currently requires initial and repetitive visual and ultrasonic inspections of propeller blades for cracks across the camber face, and, if blades are found cracked, replacement with serviceable blades. This proposed revision would increase the time-in-service (TIS) intervals between required visual and ultrasonic inspections. This proposal is prompted by an engineering analysis of