

37°55'00" N, long. 122°31'04" W; to lat 38°02'00" N, long. 122°40'04" W. That the airspace extending upward from 1,200 feet above the surface bounded on the north by lat. 38°02'00" N, on the east by a line extending from lat 38°02'00" N, long. 121°37'04" W; to lat. 37°38'00" N, long. 121°50'04" W; to lat. 37°30'00" N, long. 121°50'04" W; on the south by lat. 37°30'00" N, and on the west by the east edges of V-27 and V-199.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Los Angeles, California, on January 24, 1997.

Sabra W. Kaulia,

Assistant Manager, Air Traffic Division,  
Western Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 97-3507 Filed 2-11-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## 14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 96-AWP-35]

### Proposed Establishment of Class E Airspace; Fallbrook, CA; Correction

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

**SUMMARY:** This action corrects an error in the airspace description and allows for an extension of the comment period of a proposed notice of rulemaking that was published in the Federal Register on January 8, 1997, Airspace Docket No. 96-AWP-35.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before March 11, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Buck, Airspace Specialist, Operations Branch, AWP-530, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California, 90261, telephone (310) 725-6556.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### History

Federal Register Document 97-395, Airspace Docket No. 96-AWP-35, published on January 8, 1997, (62 FR 1072), revised the description of the Class E airspace area at Fallbrook, CA. An error was discovered in the airspace description for the Fallbrook, CA, Class E airspace area. This action corrects that error and extends the comment period until March 11, 1997.

##### Corrections to Proposed Notice of Rulemaking

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the airspace description for the Class E airspace area at Fallbrook CA, as published in the Federal Register on January 8, 1997 (62

FR 1072), (Federal Register Document 97-395); page 1073, column 1 is corrected as follows:

#### § 71.1 [Corrected]

By removing "(Paragraph 6004 Class E airspace areas designated as an extension to a Class D or Class E surface area)" and substituting "(Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth)."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### AWP CA E5 Fallbrook, CA [Corrected]

Fallbrook Community Airpark, CA  
(Lat. 33°21'15" N, long. 117°15'03" W)

On page 1073, in the first column, the airspace description for Fallbrook, CA, is corrected to read as follows:

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6-mile radius of the Fallbrook Community Airpark and within 4 miles west and 5.3 miles east of the 014° bearing from the Fallbrook Community Airpark, extending from the 6-mile radius to 20.5 miles north of the airport, excluding the portion within the Camp Pendleton, CA, Class E airspace area.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Los Angeles, California, on February 7, 1997.

Michael Lammes,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division,  
Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 97-3508 Filed 2-11-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## Surface Transportation Board

### 49 CFR Part 1111

[STB Ex Parte No. 527 (Sub-No. 1)]

#### Expedited Procedures for Processing Simplified Rail Rate Reasonableness Proceedings

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board.

**ACTION:** Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Surface Transportation Board (Board) issued a decision on December 31, 1996, in *Rate Guidelines—Non-Coal Proceedings*, Ex Parte No. 347 (Sub-No. 2), adopting simplified guidelines for determining the reasonableness of rail rates in proceedings where the Constrained Market Pricing guidelines cannot practically be applied. The Board solicits comments on how the complaint and investigation procedures at 49 CFR Part 1111 should be modified to incorporate a general procedural schedule to govern the processing of proceedings using the simplified guidelines.

**DATES:** Comments are due March 14, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments referring to STB Ex Parte No. 527 (Sub-No. 1) to: Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, 1201 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20423.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas J. Stilling, (202) 927-7312. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 927-5721.]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the ICC Termination Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-88, 109 Stat. 803 (1995)(ICCTA), new 49 U.S.C. 10704(c), the Board is required to decide the reasonableness of a challenged rate within 9 months after the record closes if the determination is based on stand-alone cost evidence, and within 6 months if it is based upon a simplified methodology. By decision served on October 1, 1996 in *Expedited Procedures for Processing Rail Rate Reasonableness, Exemption and Revocation Proceedings*, Ex Parte No. 527, published in the Federal Register on October 8, 1996 (61 FR 52710) (October decision) the Board adopted final rules to expedite the handling of challenges to the reasonableness of railroad rates including the adoption of a procedural schedule applicable in stand-alone cost cases. The general procedural schedule requires completion of the evidentiary phase of a stand-alone cost case in 7 months and the issuance of a final decision within 16 months of the filing of the complaint. 49 CFR 1111.8. The rules became effective November 16, 1996.

In the October decision, we did not adopt a procedural schedule to govern the filing of evidence in cases using the simplified rate evaluation procedures. Rather, we indicated that we would consider the adoption of regulations covering such cases following completion of the Ex Parte No. 347 (Sub-No. 2).

On December 31, 1996, we adopted simplified evidentiary guidelines to determine the reasonableness of rail rates on captive traffic where the Constrained Market Pricing guidelines<sup>1</sup> cannot be practicably applied. Consequently, we are now soliciting comments to assist us in establishing a general procedural schedule to be used in cases processed under the simplified rate evaluation procedures of Ex Parte No. 347 (Sub-No. 2). Interested parties are asked to comment on whether a general procedural schedule applicable to cases processed under the simplified guidelines can be promulgated at this time, and if so, what that schedule should be, or whether we should delay

<sup>1</sup> Stand-alone costing is part of the Constrained Market Pricing framework.