

under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

#### 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—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

#### § 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, is amended as follows:

#### Paragraph 5000 Class D Airspace

\* \* \* \* \*

*ANM UT D Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT [Revised]*

Ogden-Hickley Airport, UT

(Lat. 41°11'46" N, long. 112°00'44" W)

Ogden, Hill AFB, UT

(Lat. 41°07'25" N, long. 111°58'23" W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface up to, but not including, 7,800 feet MSL within a 4.3-mile radius of the Ogden-Hinckley Airport, excluding the portion south of a line beginning east of the airport at the intersection of the 4.3-mile radius of the Ogden-Hinckley Airport and the 4.3-mile radius of the Hill AFB, extending west to the intersection of the 4.3-mile radius of the Ogden-Hinckley and the 4.3-mile radius of the Hill AFB. This Class D airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Seattle, Washington, on March 6, 1995.

**Richard E. Prang,**

*Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division,  
Northwest Mountain Region*

[FR Doc. 95–6513 Filed 3–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 15 CFR Part 944

#### Restricting or Prohibiting Attracting Sharks by Chum or Other Means in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary; Public Hearing

**AGENCY:** Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (SRD), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public hearing.

**SUMMARY:** The National Oceanic and Atmospheric's Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (SRD) is considering amending the regulations for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS or Sanctuary) to restrict or prohibit the attracting of sharks by the use of chum or other means in the MBNMS. An advance notice of proposed rulemaking published February 28, 1995 (60 FR 10812) discussed the reasons SRD is considering restricting or prohibiting this activity in the MBNMS. A 30-day comment period closes on March 30, 1995. A public hearing has been scheduled to assist in maximizing public comment on this issue.

Individuals wishing to make a statement will be required to sign up at the door and will be limited to three minutes.

**DATES:** The hearing will be held on Wednesday, March 22, 1995, starting at 7:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The hearing will be held at the Cabrillo College, 500 Building, Room 507, 6500 Sequel Drive, Aptos, California, 95003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Aaron King at (408) 647–4257 or Elizabeth Moore at (301) 713–3141.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.429, Marine Sanctuary Program)

Dated: March 13, 1995.

**W. Stanley Wilson,**

*Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.*

[FR Doc. 95–6642 Filed 3–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–08–M

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

#### 20 CFR Part 335

**RIN: 3220–AB11**

#### Sickness Benefits

**AGENCY:** Railroad Retirement Board.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Railroad Retirement Board (Board) hereby proposes to amend its regulations under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (RUIA) to permit a “physician assistant-certified” to execute a statement of sickness in support of payments of sickness benefits under the RUIA. The proposed rule would also eliminate certain obsolete language.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before April 17, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas W. Sadler, Assistant General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611, (312) 751–4513, TDD (312) 751–4701, TDD (FTS (312) 386–4701).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 335.2(a)(2) provides that in order to be entitled to sickness benefits under the RUIA, a claimant must provide a “statement of sickness”. Section 335.3(a) of the Board’s regulations lists the individuals from whom the Board will accept a statement of sickness. That list does not currently include physician assistants. In many parts of the country, physician assistants are more accessible (and their services less expensive) than licensed medical doctors (MD’s). Under present regulations, the Board will not accept a statement of sickness or supplemental statement of sickness from a physician assistant unless there is some followup verification that the physician assistant completed the statement under the supervision of an MD. This is administratively costly and in many cases unnecessarily delays payment of sickness benefits. Thus, the Board proposes to add “physician assistant-certified” to its list of individuals from whom it will accept a statement of sickness.

The Board also proposes to amend section 335.4(d)(5) of its regulations by deleting the first sentence of paragraph (d)(5), which relates to the filing of a statement of sickness by a female employee whose claim for sickness benefits is based upon pregnancy, miscarriage or childbirth. The special form required by paragraph (d)(5) is no longer used, since, for purposes of filing for sickness benefits, a distinction is no longer made between pregnancy, miscarriage or childbirth and other illnesses.

The Board has determined that this is not a major rule for purposes of Executive Order 12866. Therefore, no regulatory analysis is required. The