Special Flight Permits

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 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 accomplished.

Incorporation by Reference

(e) The actions shall be done in accordance with Jetstream Alert Service Bulletin J41–A27–055, dated March 10, 2000. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from British Aerospace Regional Aircraft American Support, 13850 McLaren Road, Herndon, Virginia 20171. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in British airworthiness directive T = 8/2–90–905.

Effective Date

(f) This amendment becomes effective on December 13, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 30, 2000.

Donald I. Riggin,
Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–28586 Filed 11–7–00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 920

[MD–047–FOR]

Maryland Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: OSM is approving an amendment to the Maryland regulatory program under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). Maryland proposed the amendment to make its program no less effective than the federal regulations regarding procedures for financing abandoned mine reclamation projects that involve the incidental extraction of coal. The amendment is intended to revise the Maryland program to be consistent with the corresponding Federal regulations and SMCRA.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Rieger, Program Manager, OSM, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center, 3 Parkway Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15220, Telephone: (412) 937–2153; E-mail: grieger@osmre.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Maryland Program
II. Submission of the Amendment
III. Director’s Findings
IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments
V. Director’s Decision
VI. Procedural Determinations

I. Background on the Maryland Program

On February 18, 1982, the Secretary of the Interior approved the Maryland program. You can find background information on the Maryland program, including the Secretary’s findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of approval in the February 18, 1982, Federal Register (47 FR 7214). You can find subsequent actions concerning conditions of approval and program amendments at 30 CFR 920.12, 920.15, and 920.16.

II. Submission of the Amendment

By letter dated July 10, 2000 (Administrative Record No. MD–582–00), Maryland submitted the proposed amendment to its regulatory program pursuant to the federal regulations at 30 CFR 732.17(b). Maryland proposed the amendment to make its program no less effective than the federal regulations at 30 CFR 707.5, 707.10, 874.10, and 874.17. These sections of the federal regulations describe procedures for financing abandoned mine land reclamation projects that involve the incidental extraction of coal. Maryland proposed to change the definition of the term, “Government-Financed Construction” at Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR) 26.20.12.02 B(1)(a) by adding the phrase, “Funding at less than 50 percent may qualify if the construction is undertaken as an approved reclamation project under Environment Article, Title 15, Subtitle 11 Annotated Code of Maryland and 30 CFR Subchapter R.”

Maryland also added new section .04 to COMAR 26.20.12. This section is titled, “Government Funded Reclamation Projects.” The proposed rulemaking was published in the August 14, 2000, Federal Register (65 FR 49524). The public comment period closed on September 13, 2000. No one requested an opportunity to speak at a public hearing, so no hearing was held.

III. Director’s Findings

Set forth below, pursuant to SMCRA and the federal regulations at 30 CFR 732.15 and 732.17, are the Director’s findings concerning the amendments to the Maryland regulatory program.

The first change Maryland is making to its program is the modification of the definition of the term, “Government-Financed Construction” at COMAR 26.20.12.02 B(1)(a). Maryland added the
phrase, “Funding at less than 50 percent may qualify if the construction is undertaken as an approved reclamation project under Environment Article, Title 15, Subtitle 11 Annotated Code of Maryland and 30 CFR Subchapter R.” to the end of the definition. This phrase is substantially the same as a phrase from the term, “Government-financed construction” from the federal regulations at 30 CFR 707.5. The Director finds that this paragraph is approved.

Section A provides that when the Bureau is considering an abandoned mine land reclamation project as government-financed construction and the level of funding will be less than 50 percent of the total cost because of planned coal extraction, the Bureau shall determine the likelihood:

(1) That nearby or adjacent mining activities may create new environmental problems or adversely affect existing environmental problems at the site.

The Director finds that this paragraph is substantially the same as the federal regulation at 30 CFR 874.17(a)(2). This paragraph is approved.

(2) That reclamation activities at the site may adversely affect nearby or adjacent mining activities.

The Director finds that this paragraph is substantially the same as the federal regulation at 30 CFR 874.17(a)(3). This paragraph is approved.

(3) Of the coal being mined under a permit issued in accordance with Environment Article, Title 15, Subtitle 5, Annotated Code of Maryland.

The Director finds that this paragraph is substantially the same as the federal regulation at 30 CFR 874.17(a)(1). This paragraph is approved.

Subsection B provides that the determination under paragraph A(3) of this regulation shall take into account available information, such as:

(1) Coal reserves from existing mine maps or other sources;

(2) Existing environmental conditions;

(3) All prior mining activity on or adjacent to the site;

(4) Current and historic coal production in the area; and

(5) Any known or anticipated interest in the mining site.

The Director finds that these paragraphs are substantially the same as the federal regulations at 30 CFR 874.17(a)(1) (i)–(v). These paragraphs are approved.

Subsection C provides that if the Bureau decides to proceed with the reclamation project after making the determinations under section A of these regulations, the Bureau shall:

(1) Determine the limits on any coal refuse, coal waste or other coal products which may be extracted under this regulation; and

(2) Delineate the boundaries of the abandoned mine land reclamation project.

The Director finds that these paragraphs are substantially the same as 30 CFR 874.17(b)(1) and (b)(2). These paragraphs are approved.

Subsection D provides that the Bureau shall include documentation in the abandoned mine land project file for the:

(1) Determinations made under sections A and C of this regulation;

(2) Information taken into account in making the determinations; and

(3) Names of the persons making the determinations.

The Director finds that these paragraphs are substantially the same as the federal regulations at 30 CFR 874.17(c)(1)–(3). These paragraphs are approved.

Subsection E provides that for each abandoned mine land reclamation project to be approved under this regulation, the Bureau shall:

(1) Characterize the site in terms of mine drainage, active slides, and the slide prone areas, erosion and sedimentation, vegetation, toxic materials, and hydrologic balance;

(2) Ensure that the reclamation project is conducted in accordance with the provisions of Environment Article, Title 15, Subtitle 11, Annotated Code of Maryland and 30 CFR Subchapter R.

(3) Develop specific-site reclamation requirements, including performance bonds, when appropriate, in accordance with State procedures; and

(4) Require the contractor conducting the reclamation to provide, prior to the time the reclamation project begins, applicable documents that clearly authorize the extraction of coal and payment of royalties.

The Director finds that these paragraphs are substantially the same as the federal regulations at 30 CFR 874.17(d)(1)–(4). These paragraphs are approved.

Subsection F provides that the Bureau shall require a reclamation contractor who extracts coal beyond the limits of the incidental coal specified in § C(2) of this regulation to obtain a permit for the coal in accordance with Environment Article, Title 15, Subtitle 5, Annotated Code of Maryland. The Director finds that this subsection is substantially the same as the federal regulation at 30 CFR 874.17(e). This subsection is approved.

IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments

Federal Agency Comments

On July 20, 2000, we asked for comments from various federal agencies who may have an interest in the Maryland amendment (Administrative Record Number MD–582–01). On August 2, 2000, (Administrative Record Number MD–582–02), we sent a corrected amendment to the same federal agencies and again asked for their comments. Maryland corrected the original amendment submission by adding the phrase, “and 30 CFR Subchapter R” to the end of paragraph E(2).

We solicited comments in accordance with section 503(b) of SMCRA and 30 CFR 732.17(b)(11)(i) of the Federal regulations. Comments were solicited from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s Chesapeake Bay Field Office, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of Labor, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. No comments were received.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Pursuant to 30 CFR 732.17(b)(11)(i), OSM is required to solicit comments from the EPA, and, pursuant to 30 CFR 732.17(b)(11)(ii), obtain the written concurrence of the EPA with respect to those provisions of the proposed program amendment that relate to air or water quality standards promulgated under the authority of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.). By letter dated July 20, 2000, we requested comments and concurrence from EPA (Administrative Record Number MD 582–01) on the state’s proposed amendment of July 10, 2000 (Administrative Record Number MD 582–00). EPA replied to our letter on August 3, 2000 (Administrative Record Number MD 582–03) and indicated that the proposed amendment complies with the Clean Water Act.

Public Comments

No comments were received in response to our request for public comments.
V. Director’s Decision

Based on the findings above we are approving the amendments to the Maryland program. This final rule is being made effective immediately to expedite the state program amendment process and to encourage states to bring their programs into conformity with the federal standards without undue delay. Consistency of state and federal standards is required by SMCRA.

VI. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866—Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12630—Takings

This rule does not have takings implications. This determination is based on the analysis performed for the counterpart federal regulation.

Executive Order 13132—Federalism

This rule does not have federalism implications. SMCRA delineates the roles of the federal and state governments with regard to the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations. One of the purposes of SMCRA is to “establish a nationwide program to protect society and the environment from the adverse effects of surface coal mining operations.” Section 503(a)(1) of SMCRA requires that state laws regulating surface coal mining and reclamation operations be “in accordance with” the requirements of SMCRA, and section 503(a)(7) requires that state programs contain rules and regulations “consistent with” regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to SMCRA.

Executive Order 12988—Civil Justice Reform

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 and has determined that, to the extent allowed by law, this rule meets the applicable standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of state regulatory programs and program amendments since each such program is drafted and promulgated by a specific state, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(b)(10), decisions on proposed state regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the states must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

National Environmental Policy Act

Section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that a decision on a proposed state regulatory program provision does not constitute a major federal action within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)). A determination has been made that such decisions are categorically excluded from the NEPA process (516 DM 8.4.A).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 et seq.).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.). The state submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the state. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart federal regulation.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

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

a. Does not have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million.

b. Will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, federal, state, or local government agencies, or geographic regions.

c. Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S. based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

This determination is based upon the fact that the state submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose a cost of $100 million or more in any given year on any governmental entity or the private sector.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 920

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.


Allen D. Klein,
Regional Director, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, Title 30, Chapter VII, Subchapter T of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as set forth below:

PART 920—MARYLAND

1. The authority citation for part 920 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.

2. Section 920.15 is amended in the table by adding a new entry in chronological order by “Date of Final Publication” to read as follows:

§ 920.25 Approval of Maryland regulatory program amendments.
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07–00–105]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Key Largo, Monroe County, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Temporary final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District is temporarily changing the regulations of the Jewfish Creek Drawbridge at Key Largo across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1134.1 in Key Largo, Florida, until January 25, 2001. This temporary rule allows the Jewfish Creek Drawbridge at Key Largo to maintain single leaf operations with one-hour advance notice and a twelve-hour advance notification to the bridge tender to provide a double leaf opening until January 25, 2001. This is necessary to allow for repairs.

DATES: This temporary rule is effective from November 2, 2000 to January 25, 2001. Comments must be received by November 30, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments and materials received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket [CGD07–00–105] and are available for inspection or copying at Commander (obr), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 S.E. 1st Avenue, Miami, Florida, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Project Officer, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at (305) 415–6743.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

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. It was impracticable to publish an NPRM, because there was insufficient time remaining after we were notified of the dates of the repairs to follow normal rulemaking procedures.

Further, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the Federal Register. A delayed effective date is impracticable as repairs on the bridge are already underway.

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for the rulemaking [CGD07–00–105], 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 they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received. We may change this temporary 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 address under ADDRESSES, explaining why one would be beneficial. If the Coast Guard determines that a public meeting would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the Federal Register.

Background and Purpose

The Jewfish Creek Drawbridge at Key Largo, mile 1134.1, across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, has a vertical clearance of 11 feet at mean high water and a horizontal clearance of 80 feet between fenders. The existing operating regulations in 33 CFR 117.261(eq) require the bridge to open on signal; except that from 10:00 a.m. until sunset, Thursday through Sunday and Federal holidays, the draw need open only on the hour and half hour.

The Florida Department of Transportation notified the Coast Guard on October 18, 2000, that repairs to the bridge were in progress and scheduled to be completed by January 25, 2001. The repairs require that the Jewfish Creek Bridge be able to maintain single leaf operations with one-hour advance notice. However a double leaf opening can be provided with a twelve-hour advance notice provided to the bridge tender.

Regulatory Evaluation

This 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 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 Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040, February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this rule to be minimal because of the limited duration of the rule, as well as the provision for double leaf openings with advance notice.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we considered whether this rule will have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. “Small entities” include small business, 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 affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway at mile 1134. Although this temporary rule will be in effect for two and one-half months, some vessel traffic can still pass through the single leaf, and others can make advance requests for double leaf openings.