

69305). The FAA uses the direct final rulemaking procedure for a non-controversial rule where the FAA believes that there will be no adverse public comment. This direct final rule advised the public that no adverse comments were anticipated, and that unless a written adverse comment, or a written notice of intent to submit such an adverse comment, were received within the comment period, the regulation would become effective on April 15, 2004. No adverse comments were received, and thus this notice confirms that this direct final rule will become effective on that date.

Issued in Kansas City, MO, on January 23, 2004.

Paul J. Sheridan,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division, Central Region.

[FR Doc. 04-2515 Filed 2-4-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA-2002-14010; Airspace
Docket No. 02-AAL-09]

RIN 2120-AA66

Modification and Revocation of Federal Airways; AK

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action revises Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal airway Victor 317 (V-317); and revokes V-307 and V-362 in Alaska. The FAA is taking this action due to the decommissioning of the McInnes Nondirectional Radio Beacon (NDB) in Canada.

EFFECTIVE DATES: 0901 UTC, April 15, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken McElroy, Airspace and Rules Division, ATA-400, Office of Air Traffic Airspace Management, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267-8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On January 30, 2003, the FAA published, in the **Federal Register**, a notice proposing to revise V-317 and Amber 15 (A-15); and revoke V-307 and V-362 in Alaska (68 FR 4742). The proposed revision to A-15 has been

removed from this action, since a flight inspection was not completed for that portion of the original proposal. Final action on A-15 will be addressed in future rulemaking. The FAA is taking this action due to the decommissioning of the McInnes NDB in Canada.

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking effort by submitting written comments on the proposal. No comments were received regarding this proposal. With the exception of the final action on A-15 and minor editorial changes, this amendment is the same as that proposed in the notice.

The Rule

This action amends title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 (part 71) by revising V-317, and revoking V-307 and V-362 in Alaska. The FAA is taking this action due to the decommissioning of the McInnes NDB in Canada.

Alaskan VOR Federal airways are published in paragraph 6010(b) of FAA Order 7400.9L dated September 2, 2003 and effective September 16, 2003, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Alaska VOR Federal airways listed in this document would be published subsequently in the order.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this regulation: (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under Department of Transportation (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, when promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Environmental Review

The FAA has determined that this action qualifies for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1D, Policies and Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. This airspace action is not expected to cause any potentially significant environmental impacts, and no extraordinary circumstances exist that warrant preparation of an environmental assessment.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

Adoption of the Amendment

■ In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959-1963 Comp., p.389.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of FAA Order 7400.9L, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 2, 2003, and effective September 16, 2003, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6010(b) Alaskan VOR Federal Airways

* * * * *

V-307 (Revoked)

* * * * *

V-362 (Revoked)

* * * * *

V-317 (Revised)

From Vancouver, BC, Canada via Comox, BC, Canada; Port Hardy, BC, Canada; Sandspit, BC, Canada; Annette Island, AK; Level Island, AK; Sisters Island, AK; to INT Sisters Island 272° and Yakutat, AK, 139° radials. The airspace within Canada is excluded.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, January 20, 2004.

Reginald C. Matthews,

Manager, Airspace and Rules Division.

[FR Doc. 04-2437 Filed 2-4-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD08-04-001]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Alabama River, Montgomery, AL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is removing the existing drawbridge operation regulation for the draw of the U.S. 31 bridge across the Alabama River, mile 278.2 at Montgomery, Montgomery County, Alabama. A replacement bridge has been constructed and the existing historic bridge has been removed. Since the bridge has been removed, the regulation controlling the opening and closing of the bridge is no longer necessary.

DATES: This rule is effective February 5, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Documents referred to in this rule are available for inspection or copying at the office of the Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch, 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130-3396, between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (504) 589-2965. The Eighth District Bridge Administration Branch maintains the public docket for this rulemaking.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Frank, Bridge Administration Branch, at (504) 589-2965.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Good Cause for Not Publishing an NPRM

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM. Public comment is not necessary since the purpose of the affected regulation is to control the opening and closing of a bridge that has been removed.

Good Cause for Making Rule Effective in Less Than 30 Days

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds good cause exists for making this rule effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** for the same reasons stated in the preceding paragraph.

Background and Purpose

The State of Alabama (Department of Transportation) has constructed a bridge of modern safe design to replace the existing swing bridge. The existing swing bridge that had previously serviced the area has been removed. The regulation governing the operation of the swing bridge is found in 33 CFR 117.101(c). The purpose of this rule is to remove 33 CFR 117.101(c) from the Code of Federal Regulations.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of

Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

This rule removes a regulation that is obsolete because the bridge it governs no longer exists.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This rule will have no impact on any small entities because the regulation being removed applies to a bridge that no longer exists.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247).

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct

effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531-1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in the preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not cause an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order because

it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Paragraph (32)(e) excludes the promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges from the environmental documentation requirements of NEPA.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard is amending part 117 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

§ 117.101 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 117.101, paragraph (c) is removed and paragraph (d) is redesignated paragraph (c).

Dated: January 28, 2004.

J.W. Stark,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, 8th Coast Guard Dist., Acting.

[FR Doc. 04–2509 Filed 2–4–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD13–03–025]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule; change in effective period.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is revising the effective period for temporary safety zones during the tow and moor operations of the caissons being used for the Tacoma Narrows Bridge construction project. The Coast Guard is taking this action to safeguard the public from hazards associated with the transport and construction of the caissons being used to construct piers for the new bridge. These safety hazards include, but are not limited to, hazards to navigation, allisions with the caissons, allisions with the caisson mooring system, and collisions with work vessels and barges. Entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound or his designated representatives.

DATES: This rule is effective from February 6, 2004 through August 6, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Documents as indicated in this preamble are available for inspection or copying at the U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Puget Sound, 1519 Alaskan Way South, Building 1, Seattle, Washington 98134. Normal office hours are between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG. Tyana Thayer c/o Captain of the Port Puget Sound, 1519 Alaskan Way South, Seattle, Washington 98134, (206) 217–6222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

On 13 August 2003, we published a temporary final rule for Tacoma Narrows Bridge entitled "Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project" in **Federal Register** (68 FR 48282) under section 165.T13–016. This temporary final rule extends the effective period until 6 August 2004.

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this

regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) and 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM and for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Publishing a NPRM would be contrary to public interest since immediate action is necessary to ensure the safety of vessels and persons that transit in the vicinity of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge. On January 13, 2004, the State of Washington Department of Transportation (WADOT) informed the Coast Guard that the contractors involved in the new Tacoma Narrows Bridge construction project had fallen behind schedule and requested an extension. Accordingly, the dangers that exist because of this bridge construction will continue to exist after February 6, 2004. The Coast Guard continues to receive reports of boaters navigating too close to the construction zone and reports of scuba divers diving near the caissons necessitate extending the effective period of this safety zone. If normal notice and comment procedures were followed, this rule would not become effective in sufficient time. For this reason, following normal rulemaking procedures in this case would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

Background and Purpose

As of today, the need for a safety zone still exists. The Coast Guard is extending the temporary safety zone regulation on the Tacoma Narrows and adjoining waters, for the Tacoma Narrows Bridge Project through August 6, 2004. The Coast Guard has determined it is necessary to limit access to a 250-yard radius around each of the two new bridge piers. Caissons are being used to build the new bridge piers. The new bridge piers are located just north of the existing Tacoma Narrows Bridge. The dangers to persons and vessels transiting this area includes, but is not limited to, hazards to navigation, allisions with the caissons, allisions with the caisson mooring system, and collisions with work vessels and barges. The Coast Guard, through this action, intends to promote the safety of persons and vessels in the area. Entry into these zones will be prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port. Coast Guard personnel will enforce these safety zones. The Captain of the Port may be assisted by other Federal, state, or local agencies.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of