

System, which describes the application procedure.

Background

V-105

On June 20, 2001, Airspace Docket No. 01-AWP-02, FAA-2001-9559 (66 FR 30654), was published in the **Federal Register**. In that airspace docket the FAA proposed to realign V-105 and J-86 in the Phoenix, AZ, area. The June 20, 2001 NPRM contained an inadvertent error in the proposed description of V-105. Specifically, the description transposed the magnetic and true radials of V-105. This SNPRM corrects that error.

J-58 and J-86

Currently the navigational signal in the vicinity of the Gulf of Mexico is not sufficient enough to support that segment of J-58 between the Harvey, LA, Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Radio Range and Tactical Air Navigation Aids (VORTAC), and the Sarasota VORTAC. The same dilemma affects that segment of J-86 between the Leeville VORTAC and the Sarasota, FL, VORTAC. Due to the weak navigational signal affecting these routes, they no longer pass flight inspection. The FAA is therefore proposing in this action to remove the route segments over the Gulf and terminate them at the Harvey VORTAC (for J-58) and the Leeville VORTAC (for J-86) respectively.

To replace the revoked segments, over water advanced navigation routes were established under a separate action. These over water navigation routes do not rely on ground based navigation facilities and are not subject to navigation signal coverage limitations. Additionally, in this action, the FAA is proposing to rename the route segments of J-58 and J-86 in the State of Florida to avoid confusion.

The Proposal

The FAA is proposing an amendment to Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 to revise V-105 and J-86 in the vicinity of Phoenix Arizona. Specifically, this notice corrects the proposed description of V-105 between the Drake and Phoenix, AZ, VORTAC. Additionally, in this action the FAA is proposing to revise J-86 between Winslow, AZ, and the Leeville, LA, VORTAC; removes the segment of J-86 between the Leeville VORTAC and the Sarasota, FL, VORTAC; renames the J-86 route segment from the Sarasota VORTAC to the Dolphin, FL, VORTAC, J-616; amend J-58 by terminating the route at the Harvey, LA, VORTAC;

removing the segment of J-58 between the Harvey VORTAC and the Sarasota, FL, VORTAC; and renaming the route from the Sarasota VORTAC to the Dolphin, FL, VORTAC, J-614. These actions are necessary because J-58 and J-86 fail to pass flight inspection over the Gulf of Mexico due to gaps in navigation signal coverage. These changes are part of the National Airspace Redesign effort to improve system efficiency and safety.

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 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.

Jet routes and Domestic VOR Federal airways are published in paragraphs 2004 and 6010(a), respectively, of FAA Order 7400.9H dated September 1, 2000, and effective September 16, 2000, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The jet route and VOR Federal airway listed in this document would be published subsequently in the order.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Proposed Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, CLASS B, CLASS C, CLASS D, AND CLASS E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIRWAYS; 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 7400.9H,

Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 1, 2000, and effective September 16, 2000, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 2004 Jet Routes

* * * * *

J-58 [Revised]

From Oakland, CA, via Manteca, CA; Coaldale, NV; Wilson Creek, NV; Milford, UT; Farmington, NM; Las Vegas, NM; Panhandle, TX; Wichita Falls, TX; Ranger, TX; Alexandria, LA; Harvey, LA.

J-86 [Revised]

From Beatty, NV; INT Beatty 131° and Boulder City, NV, 284° radials; Boulder City; Peach Springs, AZ; INT of Peach Springs 091° (076°M) and Winslow, AZ, 301° (287°M) radials, El Paso, TX; Fort Stockton, TX; Junction, TX; Humble, TX; Leeville, LA.

J-614 [New]

Sarasota; Lee County, FL; to the INT Lee County 120° and Dolphin, FL, 293° radials; Dolphin.

J-616 [New]

Sarasota; INT Sarasota 103° and La Belle, FL, 313° radials; La Belle; to Dolphin, FL.

* * * * *

Paragraph 6010(a) Domestic VOR Federal Airways

* * * * *

V-105 [Revised]

From Tucson, AZ; INT Tucson 300° and Stanfield, AZ 145° radials; Stanfield; Phoenix, AZ; INT Phoenix 333° (321°M) and Drake, AZ, 182° (168°M) radials; Drake; 25 miles, 22 miles 85 MSL; Boulder City, NV; Las Vegas, NV; INT Las Vegas 266° and Beatty, NV, 142° radials; 17 miles, 105 MSL; Beatty; 105 MSL, Coaldale, NV; 82 miles, 110 MSL; to Mustang, NV.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 5, 2001.

Reginald C. Matthews,

Manager, Airspace and Rules Division.

[FR Doc. 01-22771 Filed 9-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-01-144]

RIN 2115-AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Back River, ME

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the drawbridge

operating regulations governing the operation of the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) highway bridge, at mile 4.6, between Hodgdon and Barter's Island at Boothbay, Maine. This proposed temporary change to the drawbridge operation regulations would allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from December 15, 2001 through April 15, 2002. This action is necessary to facilitate structural repairs at the bridge.

DATES: Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before November 13, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to Commander (obr), First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA. 02110-3350, or deliver them to the same address between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (617) 223-8364. The First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John W. McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223-8364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments or related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD01-01-144), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know if they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we

determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background

The MDOT, highway bridge, at mile 4.6, across the Back River has a vertical clearance of 6 feet at mean high water and 15 feet at mean low water. The existing regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.523.

The bridge owner, MDOT, asked the Coast Guard to temporarily change the drawbridge operation regulations to facilitate structural repairs at the bridge. This proposed temporary rule would allow the bridge owner to keep the bridge in the closed position from December 15, 2001 through April 15, 2002. The bridge operates on a twenty-four hours advance notice from November 1 through May 31, normally. The local fishermen haul out their equipment during the month of November, after which, the bridge historically receives few requests to open.

Discussion of Proposal

This proposed temporary change to the drawbridge operation regulations would allow the bridge owner to keep the bridge in the closed position from December 15, 2001 through April 15, 2002, while structural repairs are underway at the bridge.

The number of bridge openings from December through April in past years have been relatively low. The bridge opening log data for December through April for the past three years is as follows:

	1998	1999	2000
December	4	0	0
January	0	0	0
February	0	0	0
March	0	0	0
April	0	0	0

The Coast Guard believes this rulemaking is reasonable based upon the relatively low number of bridge opening requests during past years December through April and the fact that this work is necessary maintenance required to assure continued uninterrupted operation of the bridge.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under 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 Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040, Feb. 26, 1979).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation, under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT, is unnecessary. This conclusion is based on the fact that there have been few requests to open the bridge historically, during the time period that the bridge would be closed.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we considered whether this proposed 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 section 5 U.S.C. 605(b), that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This conclusion is based upon the fact that there have been few requests historically, to open the bridge during the time period the bridge would be closed.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Collection of Information

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

Federalism

We have analyzed this proposed rule under E.O. 13132 and have determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531-1538) governs the issuance of Federal regulations that require unfunded mandates. An unfunded mandate is a regulation that requires a State, local, or tribal government or the private sector to incur direct costs without the Federal Government's having first provided the

funds to pay those costs. This proposed rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under E.O. 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

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

Protection of Children

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

Environment

We considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, this proposed rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation because promulgation of drawbridge regulations have been found not to have a significant effect on the environment. A written "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is not required for this rule.

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 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.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 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; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05-1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102-587, 106 Stat. 5039.

§ 117.523 [Suspended]

2. From December 15, 2001, through April 15, 2002, § 117.523 is suspended.

3. From December 15, 2001 through April 15, 2002, § 117.T524 is temporarily added to read as follows:

§ 117.T524 Back River.

The Maine Department of transportation highway bridge, mile 4.6, between Hodgdon and Barter's Island at Boothbay, need not open for the passage of vessel traffic.

Dated: August 28, 2001.

G.N. Naccara,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 01-22777 Filed 9-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-01-142]

RIN 2115-AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Dorchester Bay, MA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the drawbridge operating regulations governing the operation of the William T. Morrissey Boulevard Bridge, at mile 0.0, across Dorchester Bay at Boston, Massachusetts. This proposed temporary change to the drawbridge operation regulations would allow the

bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2001 through May 10, 2002. This action is necessary to facilitate rehabilitation construction at the bridge.

DATES: Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 11, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to Commander (obr), First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA. 02110-3350, or deliver them to the same address between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (617) 223-8364. The First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John W. McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223-8364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments or related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD01-01-142), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know if they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.