

## Economic Impact

There are approximately 564 engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 180 engines installed on airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 0.5 work hour per engine to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required aft cooling plates would cost approximately \$15,282 per engine. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$2,756,160. The manufacturer has stated that it may provide the new design aft cooling plate at no cost to operators, and that if the aft cooling plate is replaced at the next engine or hot section module overhaul shop visit, no additional labor costs will be incurred.

## Regulatory Impact

This proposed rule does not have federalism implications, as defined in Executive Order 13132, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Accordingly, the FAA has not consulted with state authorities prior to publication of this proposed rule.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

## List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

## The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

## PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

### § 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

**GE Aircraft Engines:** Docket No. 2000-NE-61-AD.

**Applicability:** This airworthiness directive (AD) is applicable to GE Aircraft Engines (GE) CT7 Models CT7-5A2, -5A3, -7A, and -7A1 turboprop engines, installed on but not limited to Construcciones Aeronauticas, SA CN-235 series and SAAB Aircraft AB SF340 series airplanes.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each engine identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For engines that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

### Compliance

Compliance is required at the next overall of the engine or hot section module, or within 8,000 cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, unless already done.

To prevent stage 2 turbine aft cooling plate cracking, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the airplane, do the following:

(a) Replace stage 2 aft cooling plate P/N 6064T07P02 with stage 2 aft cooling plate P/N 6064T07P05.

(b) After the effective date of this AD, do not install any stage 2 aft cooling plate P/N 6064T07P02.

### Alternative Methods of Compliance

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Engine Certification Office (ECO). Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, ECO.

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

### Special Flight Permits

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance §§ 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.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on April 24, 2001.

**Donald E. Plouffe,**

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

[FR Doc. 01-10889 Filed 5-1-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 164

[USCG-2001-8826]

RIN 2115-AG09

### Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems for Commercial Vessels

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to amend its regulations to allow commercial vessels to use as their primary means of navigation in U.S. waters an electronic charting and navigation system that meets the Electronic Charting Display and Information System (ECDIS) standard of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). Allowing commercial vessels to use modern electronic charting technology may reduce the potential for human error by providing a continuous update of a vessel's position for the mariner. To obtain information needed to amend this rule, the Coast Guard asks for comments from the public on the questions listed in this document.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Docket Management Facility on or before July 2, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** To make sure your comments and related material are not entered more than once in the docket, please submit them by only one of the following means:

(1) By mail to the Docket Management Facility (USCG 2001-8826), U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001.

(2) By delivery to room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (202) 366-9329.

(3) By fax to the Docket Management Facility at (202) 493-2251.

(4) Electronically through the Web Site for the Docket Management System at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For questions on this proposed rule, contact David Beach, Office of Vessel Traffic Management, Coast Guard, telephone 202-267-6623. For questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Dorothy Beard, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-9329.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **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 and identify the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG 2001-8826). Please indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. You may submit your comments and material by mail, hand delivery, fax, or electronic means to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**; but please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. The Coast Guard may change this proposed rule in view of the comments received.

##### **Public Meeting**

As of now, the Coast Guard does not plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a public meeting to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine 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**

Currently, self-propelled vessels 1600 gross tons and over (with some exceptions) are required to use printed charts and publications and manually plot their position while navigating in U.S. waters. The existing regulations require a vessel to maintain current paper charts and publications for the area to be transited. Paper charts and publications requiring labor-intensive corrections cannot be updated as expeditiously as an electronic charting system. Rapid improvements in electronic technology and communications may offer viable options to replace these traditional methods and tools of navigation.

Existing computer applications can eliminate paper documents and reduce the time needed to obtain updated navigation information. Today, computer technology can instantly assimilate data from multiple satellite sources and allow continuous information updates to a vessel's navigation and positioning. The Coast Guard realizes that updating or correcting printed navigation material (i.e. charts and publications) requires a considerable expenditure of time and effort for the commercial shipping industry.

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has adopted Electronic Charting Display Information Systems (ECDIS) standards for vessels on international voyages, and electronic charting systems are commercially available for even the smallest vessels. The Coast Guard is considering the feasibility of allowing commercial vessels the option to use ECDIS as their primary means of navigation in the navigable waters of the United States.

Under a separate rulemaking, the Coast Guard is publishing a Direct Final Rule allowing public vessels to use electronic charting and navigation systems as their primary means of navigation while transiting in the navigable waters of the United States. The Coast Guard is also planning to conduct an operational evaluation of certain electronic charting and navigation systems that are commercially available. This evaluation will assist the Coast Guard in determining if there are other charting and navigation systems incorporating electronic technology that are functionally equivalent to those required by IMO. If there are functionally equivalent systems that do not meet all of the IMO ECDIS

requirements, the Coast Guard may attempt to readdress IMO acceptance of these systems at a later date.

##### **Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The Coast Guard is considering amending existing regulations to allow commercial vessels to use an IMO compliant ECDIS as their primary means of navigation in the navigable waters of the United States. Commercial vessels using an ECDIS that meets the IMO standard will have the option to be exempt from the paper chart requirement listed in 33 CFR 164.30 and the requirement for printed navigational publications found in 33 CFR 164.33. Vessels that choose to operate without an IMO compliant ECDIS would continue to navigate using corrected and up to date printed charts and publications in accordance with applicable regulations.

##### **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 section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget under this Order has not reviewed the rule. 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 so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

##### **Small Entities**

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Coast Guard must consider 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.

Presently, the impact of the proposed rulemaking would have on small entities has not been determined. Any impact on small entities will be assessed in a preliminary Regulatory Flexibility Assessment. 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 to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**. In your comment

explain how you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

#### Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-121), the Coast Guard would assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. The proposed rulemaking would provide small businesses or organizations an opportunity to comment and will provide a point of contact for any questions on the proposed rulemaking's provisions and its options for compliance. The Coast Guard will provide State's Small Business Development Centers (SBDC) with copies of the proposed rulemaking for further distribution. Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal Regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247).

#### Collection of Information

This proposed rule does not provide for a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. *et seq.*).

#### Questions

The Coast Guard requests your comments and any data or information that would answer the following questions, as well as comments on any other part of the current regulations that should be revised. In responding to a question, please explain your reasons for each answer so that we can carefully weigh the consequences and impact of any future requirements we may propose. In addition, please provide relevant data (data on operational incidents resulting in personal injury, property damage, or pollution would be particularly useful), if possible that would support the need for excluding commercial vessels from certain requirements regarding the carriage of paper navigational charts, and publications.

#### Usage

1. Should ECDIS systems be allowed as an alternative to paper charts for commercial vessels?
2. Which categories of self-propelled vessels (1600 or more gross tons) will install the optional ECDIS system as defined by IMO, as an alternative for the paper charts required by 33 CFR part 164?
3. How many self-propelled vessels of less than 1600 gross tons may install an ECDIS system?
4. If you are planning to install ECDIS, what factors led you to this decision?
5. If you are not planning to install ECDIS, what factors led you to this decision?
6. Are you considering ECDIS as a stand-alone unit, or as part of an Integrated Bridge System?

#### Costs

1. What is the cost for an ECDIS system (software/hardware)?
2. How much would you estimate it would cost to have an ECDIS system installed on your vessel?
3. Once the ECDIS system is installed, what kind of maintenance would the system need?
4. How much does the maintenance of the system cost and how often (annual, quarterly, monthly) would it need to be conducted?
5. What is the average operational life of the ECDIS system? Is there a projected time when the system should be replaced?
6. What does it cost to update electronic charts? How is the update information provided? How often is the update information provided?
7. How does the electronic chart service compare to your current service for paper charts?
8. What are the economic benefits to a company that would use ECDIS instead of existing paper charts? What other potential benefits can be provided by the use of ECDIS?
9. Are there other electronic charting and navigational systems that should be considered?
10. How many paper charts are purchased on average per year? How much do the charts cost? How much does it cost to have the paper charts updated and how often are they updated (annually, quarterly, monthly)?

#### Operations

1. What kind of training would be required to use an ECDIS system?
2. What would be the estimated time period for the training and what are the involved costs?
3. Who would be responsible for conducting the training?

4. What are the potential benefits of using an ECDIS system in lieu of paper charts on board a vessel?

5. IMO requires an acceptable backup for ECDIS systems. What is an acceptable backup system (A second, independent ECDIS system, an electronic charting system, manually updated and corrected paper charts)? If paper, how many charts and what scale do you recommend?

6. Which electronic navigation system components need to be backed up (i.e. power, positioning, communications)?

7. What means does an ECDIS use to provide voyage reconstruction for the purpose of marine casualty investigation and how long does the system retain this data?

8. Are there mediums to share and display this data?

9. Can ECDIS display charts and the navigation publications simultaneously?

#### Miscellaneous

1. Should we allow electronic versions of publications as well as charts?

2. How would any proposed regulation affect small entities?

Comments are not limited to the preceding questions and are invited on any aspect of this proposal or of implementing the electronic charting and navigation requirements for commercial vessels.

Dated: March 23, 2001.

**R.C. North,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 01-10835 Filed 5-1-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA 153-0195b; FRL-6958-2]

### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve revisions to the Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD) State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concern the permitting of stationary sources of air emissions. We are proposing to approve local rules to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).