

appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Boston ACO.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Boston ACO.

#### Special Flight Permits

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be done.

**Note 3:** The subject of this AD is addressed in CAA airworthiness directive 005-04-2000.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on March 14, 2002.

**Francis A. Favara,**

*Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 02-6914 Filed 3-21-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### 14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 01-AGL-08]

#### Proposed Modification of Class E Airspace; Frankfort, MI; Correction

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This action corrects the docket number and four errors in the legal description of a NPRM that was published in the *Federal Register* on Monday, January 7, 2002 (67 FR 705). The NPRM proposed to modify Class E Airspace at Frankfort, MI.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Denis C. Burke, Air Traffic Division, Airspace Branch, AGL-520, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, IL 60018, telephone: (847) 294-7477.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### History

Federal Register document 02-250 published on Monday, January 7, 2002 (67 FR 705), proposed to modify Class E Airspace at Frankfort, MI. An incorrect Airspace Docket No. 00-AGL-08 was assigned to the proposal, and in addition, the following errors were contained in the legal description: Incorrect longitude for the Frankfort Dow Memorial Field Airport, an incorrect MBL VOR/DME radial was used to describe the extension, and the latitude and longitude for the MBL

VOR/DME was omitted. This action corrects these errors.

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the errors for the Class E Airspace, Frankfort, MI, as published in the *Federal Register* Monday, January 7, 2002 (67 FR 705), (FR Doc. 02-250), are corrected as follows:

1. On page 705, column 2, in the heading, and column 3, under "Comments Invited", correct the Airspace Docket No. to read "01-AGL-08."

#### § 71.1 [corrected]

2. On page 706, column 2, correct the legal description of the airspace designation as follows:

a. Add the following immediately below "AGL MI E5 Frankfort, MI [REVISED]": Manistee VOR/DME (Lat. 44°16'14" N., long 86°15'14" W.)

b. Correct the Frankfort Dow Memorial Field Airport longitude to read:

"Long. 86°12'02" W."

c. Correct "Manistee VOR/DME 186° radial" to read "Manistee VOR/DME 006° radial."

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on February 6, 2002.

**Richard K. Petersen,**

*Assistant Manager, Air Traffic Division, Great Lakes Region.*

[FR Doc. 02-5119 Filed 3-21-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Indian Gaming Commission

#### 25 CFR Part 502

RIN 3141-AA10

#### Definitions: Electronic or Electromechanical Facsimile; Games Similar to Bingo; Electronic, Computer or Other Technologic Aid to Class II Games

**AGENCY:** National Indian Gaming Commission, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed Rule for Final Comment.

**SUMMARY:** The National Indian Gaming Commission (Commission) proposes to clarify the regulatory definitions of three key terms in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, "electronic and electromechanical facsimile", "games similar to bingo" and "electronic, computer or other technologic aid to Class II gaming". The Commission believes that these amendments may simplify the classification of games.

**DATES:** Comments may be submitted on or before April 22, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Penny Coleman, at 202/632-7003 or, by fax, at 202/632-7066 (these are not toll-free numbers).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) 25 U.S.C. 2701-2721, enacted on October 17, 1988, established the Commission. Under the Act, the Commission is charged with regulating gaming by Indian tribes. On April 9, 1992, the Commission issued a final rule defining several key terms that were not fully defined in the statute. In light of the experience that it has developed in the past ten years in working with these definitions, the Commission believes that it may be time to reevaluate some of these definitions. Accordingly, on June 22, 2001, the Commission published a Proposed Rule seeking public comment on the proposed removal of the existing definition of "electronic or electromechanical facsimile" from the Commission's regulations and using instead the plain language interpretation that seems to have been preferred by the courts.

The Commission received numerous comments to this proposed rule, a majority of which indicated support for the proposal. However, even many of the supportive comments expressed the view that removing the current definition was merely a first step in addressing the questions at issue. Several comments indicated that the Commission should remove the definition and replace it with another definition providing additional substantive guidance.

The Commission addresses these comments by proposing a new definition of "electronic or electromechanical facsimile." In light of the comments, the Commission also proposes changes to two related definitions for which it seeks additional comment.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act

To the extent that tribal gaming operations may be considered small businesses and therefore small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, this rule will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities. Indian Tribes are not considered to be small entities for the purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

#### Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business