

through 3.F. of the Accomplishment Instructions of RR SB No. RB.211-72-E148, dated March 13, 2003, and RR SB No. RB.211-72-E150, Revision 1, dated June 4, 2003.

(2) For RB211-524G2, RB211-524G2-T, RB211-524G3, RB211-524G3-T, RB211-524H, and RB211-524H-T series engines, use paragraphs 3.A. through 3.M. of the Accomplishment Instructions of RR SB No. RB.211-72-E171, Revision 1, dated February 8, 2005.

(3) If the disk passes the ECI and you find no cracks, you may extend the cycle life as specified in paragraph (m) of this AD.

Definition of Shop Visit

(l) The manufacturer defines a shop visit as the separation of an engine major case flange. This definition excludes shop visits when only field maintenance type activities are performed in lieu of performing them on-wing (such as to perform an on-wing

inspection of a tail engine installation on a Lockheed L-1011 airplane).

Cyclic Life Extension

(m) Disks that pass an optional inspection may remain in service after that inspection for the additional cycles listed in the following Table 5, until the next inspection, until the cyclic life limit published in the RR Time Limits Manual, 05-10-01, is reached, or December 1, 2008, whichever occurs first.

TABLE 5.—CYCLIC LIFE EXTENSION

Type of extension	Engine models			
	-524G2, G2-T, G3, G3-T, H2, H2-T, H-36, H-T-36	-524D4, D4-B, D4-B-39, D4X, D4X-B, D4-39	-524B2, B2-B, C2, C2-B	-524B-02, B-B-02, B3-02, B4-02, B4-D-02
Extension After Passing MPI	1,600 cycles	2,000 cycles	2,000 cycles	2,000 cycles
Extension After Passing In-Shop ECI	3,800 cycles	4,500 cycles	4,500 cycles	4,500 cycles
Extension After Passing On-Wing ECI	1,000 cycles	1,200 cycles	1,200 cycles	1,200 cycles

Disks That Have Been Intermixed Between Engine Models

(n) The RR Time Limits Manual, 05-00-01, contains information on intermixing disks between engine models.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(o) The Manager, Engine Certification Office, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

Credit for Previous Inspections

(p) Inspections done using RR SB No. RB.211-72-E150, dated April 17, 2003, SB No. RB.211-72-E171, dated December 14, 2004, SB No. RB.211-72-D428, Revision 3, dated June 30, 2003, and ASB No. RB.211-72-AD428, Revision 4, dated March 7, 2005, meet the requirements of this AD.

Reporting Requirement

(q) Report findings of all inspections of the IPC stage 5 disk using paragraph 3.B.(2) of the Accomplishment Instructions of RR No. ASB RB.211-72-AD428, Revision 5, dated March 18, 2005. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the reporting requirements specified in Paragraph 3.B. of the Accomplishment Instructions of RR No. ASB RB.211-72-AD428, Revision 5, dated March 18, 2005, and assigned OMB control number 2120-0056.

Related Information

(r) CAA airworthiness directive G-2005-0008, dated March 8, 2005, also addresses the subject of this AD.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on June 30, 2006.

Thomas A. Boudreau,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.
[FR Doc. E6-10771 Filed 7-10-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-06-051]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Saugus River, Lynn and Revere, MA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the drawbridge operating regulations governing the operation of the General Edwards SR1A Bridge, at mile 1.7, across the Saugus River between Lynn and Revere, Massachusetts. This change to the drawbridge operation regulations would allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2006 through April 30, 2007. This action is necessary to facilitate structural maintenance at the bridge.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before August 10, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (dpb), First Coast Guard District Bridge Branch, 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02110, or deliver them to the same address between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except, Federal holidays. The telephone number is (617) 223-8364. The First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as

documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223-8364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request or 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 this rulemaking (CGD01-06-051), 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 if they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting; however, you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one 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 General Edwards SR1A Bridge at mile 1.7, across the Saugus River, has a vertical clearance of 27 feet at mean high water and 36 feet at mean low water. The existing regulations at 33 CFR 117.618(b) require the draw to open on signal, except that, from April 1 through November 30, midnight to 8 a.m. an eight-hour notice is required. From December 1 through March 31, an eight-hour notice is required at all times for bridge openings.

The bridge owner, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), asked the Coast Guard to temporarily change the drawbridge operation regulations to allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2006 through April 30, 2007, to complete structural rehabilitation construction at the bridge. The bridge was closed during the same time period from November 2005 through April 2006, to perform the first phase of this rehabilitation work. Work could not be completed during the closure period in 2005–2006, necessitating a second closure period in 2006–2007.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed change would suspend the existing drawbridge operation regulations, listed at 33 CFR 117.618(b), and add a new temporary paragraph (d) to allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2006 through April 30, 2007.

The Coast Guard believes this proposed rule is reasonable because bridge openings are rarely requested during the time period the SR1A Bridge will be closed for these repairs November through April.

In fact, there were only seven requests to open the bridge in November of 2004, and no requests to open the bridge between December 2004 and March of 2005. The bridge was closed for repairs from November 2005 through April of 2006. The Coast Guard received no comments or complaints during the closure period.

In addition, this work is vital, necessary, and must be performed in order to assure the continued safe and reliable operation of the bridge.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, 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 Homeland Security.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

This conclusion is based on the fact that the bridge rarely opens during the November through April time period.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered 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.

The Coast Guard certifies under section 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This conclusion is based on the fact that the bridge rarely opens during the November through April time period.

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 (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why 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), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact, Commander (dpb), First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, One South Street, New York, NY, 10004. The telephone number is (212) 668–7165. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and

responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 5100.1, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, we believe that this rule should be categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation as this action relates to the promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction, an "Environmental Analysis Checklist" is

not required for this rule. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether to categorically exclude this rule from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. From, November 1, 2006 through April 30, 2007, § 117.618(b) is suspended and a new paragraph (d) is added to read as follows:

§ 117.618 Saugus River.

* * * * *

(d) The draw of the General Edwards SR1A Bridge at mile 1.7, need not open for the passage of vessel traffic from November 1, 2006 through April 30, 2007.

Dated: June 16, 2006.

Mark J. Campbell,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. E6–10760 Filed 7–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R03–OAR–2006–0059; FRL–8192–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; State Implementation Plan Revision for Burlington Industries, Clarksville, VA

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia. This revision pertains to the removal of a Consent Agreement from the Virginia SIP. The Consent Agreement was written for the control of emissions of sulfur dioxide from the Burlington Industries facility located in Clarksville,

Mecklenburg County, Virginia. This Agreement has been superseded by a federally enforceable state operating permit dated May 17, 2004, which imposes operating restrictions on the facility's boilers and the subsequent shutdown of the remainder of the facility. This action is being taken under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before August 10, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID Number EPA–R03–OAR–2006–0059 by one of the following methods:

A. <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

B. *E-mail:* campbell.david@epa.gov

C. *Mail:* EPA–R03–OAR–2006–0059, David J. Campbell, Chief, Permits and Technical Assistance Branch, Mailcode 3AP11, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

D. *Hand Delivery:* At the previously-listed EPA Region III address. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R03–OAR–2006–0059. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change, and may be made available online at www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through www.regulations.gov or e-mail. The www.regulations.gov Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through www.regulations.gov, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid