Federal Register

8–26–02
Vol. 67 No. 165
Pages 54727–54940

Monday
Aug. 26, 2002

HeinOnline -- 67 Fed. Reg. I 2002

FDC date	State	City	Airport	FDC No.	Subject
07/12/02	CA	Blythe	Blythe	2/7030	VOR/DME or GPS Rwy 26, Amdt 5A. This replaces 2/6374 in TL02–16.
07/12/02	CA	Blythe	Blythe	2/7044	VOR or GPS–A, Amdt 6A. This replaces 2/6375 in TL02–16.

[FR Doc. 02–21581 Filed 8–23–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

19 CFR Part 177

[T.D. 02–49]

RIN 1515–AC56

Administrative Rulings

AGENCY: Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document makes two corrections to the document published in the **Federal Register** on August 16, 2002, as T.D. 02–49 which set forth final amendments to those provisions of the Customs Regulations that concern the issuance of administrative rulings and related written determinations and decisions on prospective and current transactions arising under the Customs and related laws.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These corrections are effective August 16, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Elkins, Textiles Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings (202–572–8790).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 16, 2002, Customs published in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 53483) T.D. 02–49 to set forth final amendments to those provisions of the Customs Regulations that concern the issuance of administrative rulings and related written determinations and decisions on prospective and current transactions arising under the Customs and related laws. The regulatory changes involve primarily the addition of a new § 177.12 to set forth procedures regarding the modification or revocation of rulings on prospective transactions, internal advice decisions, protest review decisions, and treatment previously accorded by Customs to substantially identical transactions. The amendments are in response to statutory changes made to the administrative ruling process by section 623 of the Customs Modernization provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act and take effect on September 16, 2002.

This document makes two corrections to cross-reference citations within paragraphs (c) and (d) of § 177.12.

Corrections of Publication

The document published in the **Federal Register** as T.D. 02–49 on August 16, 2002 (67 FR 53483) is corrected as set forth below.

§ 177.12 [Corrected]

1. On page 53498, in the first column, in § 177.12, the first sentence of paragraph (c)(2)(ii) is corrected by removing the reference "§ 177.19" and adding, in its place, the reference "§ 177.9".

2. On page 53498, in the second column, in § 177.12, paragraph (d)(1)(viii) is corrected by removing the reference "§ 177.22 of this part" and adding, in its place, the reference "§ 177.10(c)".

Dated: August 20, 2002.

Harold Singer,

Chief, Regulations Branch.

[FR Doc. 02–21636 Filed 8–23–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

25 CFR Parts 112, 116, 121, 123, 125, 154, 156, 178, and 243

RIN 1076–AE20

Trust Management Reform: Repeal of Outdated Rules

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule; removal of rules.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is removing nine outdated parts of Title 25 CFR. This action is meant to further fulfill the Secretary's responsibility to federally-recognized tribes and individual Indians by ensuring that regulations, policies, and procedures are up-to-date. The parts being removed include regulations relating to distribution of tribal funds among tribal members, establishment of private trusts for the Five Civilized Tribes, distribution of Osage Judgment Funds, assignment of future income from the Alaska Native Fund, payment of Sioux benefits, preparation of a competency roll of Osage Indians, reallotment of lands to Indian children, resale of lands within the Badlands Air Force Range, and registration of reindeer ownership in Alaska. In the interests of economy of administration, and because all of the regulations proposed to be removed are outdated, they are included in one rulemaking vehicle.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 25, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda L. Richardson, Trust Policies and Procedures Subproject, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1849 C Street, NW., MS–4070–MIB, Washington, DC 20240, telephone 202–208–6411.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background
II. Response to Comments
III. Procedural Requirements
A. Review Under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review)
B. Review Under Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform)
C. Review Under Executive Order 12291 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act
D. Review Under Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996
E. Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act
F. Review Under Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)
G. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
H. Review Under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995
I. Review Under Executive Order 12630 (Takings Implication Assessment)
J. Review Under Executive Order 13175 (Tribal Consultation)

I. Background

Proper management of Indian trust assets has been hampered by a lack of comprehensive, consistent, up-to-date regulations, policies, and procedures covering the entire trust cycle. The BIA began revising its trust management regulations by issuing proposed revisions to regulations governing probate, trust funds, leasing, and grazing. Updated regulations affecting

HeinOnline -- 67 Fed. Reg. 54733 2002

these functions became effective on March 23, 2001.

In April 2001, BIA submitted a report to senior Departmental officials that provided a comprehensive review of regulations, manuals and handbooks that guide trust operations. The report included recommended actions to bring all policies and procedures current and outlined a multi-year schedule to accomplish this goal. The review identified a number of regulations still on the books that are no longer operative, either because all actions required by law have been fully implemented or because the regulation no longer comports with Federal Indian policy. On February 21, 2002 (67 FR 7985), BIA published a proposed rule with a request for comments to remove 25 CFR parts 112, 116, 121, 123, 125, 154, 156, 178, and 243.

II. Response to Comments

The BIA received comments from three Indian tribes, none of whom objected to the proposed removal of the nine parts; therefore, no changes have been made.

III. Procedural Requirements

A. Review Under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review)

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the BIA must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines a "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

The rule would remove a number of outdated regulations. As such, it does not impose a compliance burden on the economy generally or on any person or entity. Accordingly, this rule is not a "significant regulatory action" from an economic standpoint, and it does not otherwise create any inconsistencies or budgetary impacts to any other agency or Federal program.

B. Review Under Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform)

With respect to the review of existing regulations and the promulgation of new regulations, subsection 3(a) of Executive Order 12988, "Civil Justice Reform," 61 FR 4729 (February 7, 1996), imposes on Executive agencies the general duty to adhere to the following requirements: (1) Eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity; (2) write regulations to minimize litigation; and (3) provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct rather than a general standard and promote simplification and burden reduction.

With regard to the review of proposed regulations, subsection 3(b) of Executive Order 12988 specifically requires that Executive agencies make every reasonable effort to ensure that the regulation: (1) Clearly specifies the preemptive effect, if any; (2) clearly specifies any effect on existing Federal law or regulation; (3) provides a clear legal standard for affected conduct while promoting simplification and burden reduction; (4) specifies the retroactive effect, if any; (5) adequately defines key terms; and (6) addresses other important issues affecting clarity and general draftsmanship under any guidelines issued by the Attorney General.

Subsection 3(c) of Executive Order 12988 requires agencies to review proposed regulations in light of applicable standards in section 3(a) and section 3(b) to determine whether they are met or it is unreasonable to meet one or more of them. The BIA has determined that the removal of outdated parts meets the relevant standards of Executive Order 12988.

C. Review Under Executive Order 12291 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because this rule would remove outdated regulations, the BIA has determined that this rule is not a significant rule under Executive Order 12866. This rule was also reviewed under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, which requires preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis for any rule which is likely to have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This rule updates the Department's policies and procedures that apply to certain Indian trust resources by eliminating unneeded regulatory requirements. Accordingly, the BIA has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, and, therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

D. Review Under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This proposed rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more. The effect of this rulemaking will be to streamline and modernize policies, procedures and management operations of the BIA by eliminating unnecessary regulations. No increases in costs for administration will be realized, and no prices would be affected through these revisions as, in practice, the regulations being removed are already inoperative.

This rulemaking will not result in any significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, or innovation, nor on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets. These administrative revisions to BIA policy and procedure will not have an impact on any small business businesses or enterprises.

E. Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule is exempt from the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, since it repeals existing regulations. An OMB form 83–1 is not required.

F. Review Under Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

This rule will not have substantial direct effects 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. There is no Federalism impact on the trust relationship or balance of power between the United States government and the various tribal governments affected by this rulemaking. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132, it is determined that this rule will not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

G. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

This rule does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, neither an Environmental Assessment nor an Environmental

HeinOnline -- 67 Fed. Reg. 54734 2002

Impact Statement is necessary for this proposed rule.

H. Review Under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, Public Law 104–4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on state, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the Act, the BIA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with "Federal mandates" that may result in expenditures to state, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year. This rule will not result in the expenditure by state, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year.

I. Review Under Executive Order 12630 (Takings Implication Assessment)

In accordance with Executive Order 12630, this rule does not have significant takings implications. This rule does not involve the "taking" of private property interests.

J. Review under Executive Order 13175 (Tribal Consultation)

The BIA determined that, because the removal of current regulations has tribal implications, it was an appropriate topic for consultation with tribal governments. This consultation is in keeping with Executive Order 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments." In April 2001, BIA sent all tribal leaders a report that documents the results of a BIA review of existing regulations, policies, and procedures that affect delivery of trust services to tribal governments and individual Indians. Included in the report was a multi-year schedule for bringing all trust regulations, policies and procedures up-to-date. In May 2001, the BIA sent all tribal leaders a letter describing and identifying ten parts of Title 25 CFR that we were considering for removal. Regional directors followed up to determine if there were tribal concerns with any aspects of the proposal.

Following publication of the proposed rule, BIA again notified tribal governments of the substance of this rulemaking through a direct mailing. This enabled tribal officials and the affected tribal constituency throughout Indian Country to have meaningful and timely input in the development of the final rule.

List of Subjects

25 CFR Part 112

Indians—business and finance.

25 CFR Part 116

Estates, Indians—business and finance, Trusts and trustees.

25 CFR Part 121

Indians—claims, Indians—judgment funds.

25 CFR Part 123

Alaska, Indian—claims.

25 CFR Part 125

Indians—claims, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

25 CFR Part 154

Indians—lands.

25 CFR Part 156

Indians—lands.

25 CFR Part 178

Indians—lands.

25 CFR Part 243

Alaska, Indians—business and finance, Reindeer.

Accordingly, under the authority in 25 U.S.C. 9, 25 CFR chapter 1 is amended by removing parts 112, 116, 121, 123, 125, 154, 156, 178, and 243.

Dated: August 12, 2002.

Neal A. McCaleb,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 02–21692 Filed 8–23–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[TD 9003]

RIN 1545–AW64

Relief From Joint and Several Liability; Correction

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Correction to final regulations.

SUMMARY: This document contains a correction to final regulations that were published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, July 18, 2002 (67 FR 47278), relating to relief from joint and several liability.

DATES: This correction is effective July 18, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles A. Hall (202) 622–4940 (not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The final regulations that are the subject of this correction is under section 6015 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Need for Correction

As published, the final regulations contains an error that my prove to be misleading and is in need of clarification.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication of the final regulations (TD 9003), that were the subject of FR Doc. 02–17866, is corrected as follows:

On page 47294, column 3, § 1.6015–5(b)(3), line 10, the language "CDP hearing procedures under sections" is corrected to read "CDP hearing procedures under section".

Cynthia E. Grigsby,

Chief, Regulations Unit, Associate Chief Counsel, (Income Tax & Accounting).

[FR Doc. 02–21693 Filed 8–23–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP San Diego 02–016]

RIN 2115–AA97

Safety Zone; San Diego Bay, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing two (2) temporary safety zones: A stationary safety zone and a moving safety zone, both on the navigable waters of North San Diego Bay in support of the Parade of Ships-Festival of Sail. These temporary safety zones are necessary to provide for the safety of the crews, spectators, participants of the event, participating vessels and other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within these safety zones unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from 12:30 [PDT] to 4:30 [PDT] on September 12, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket [COTP San

HeinOnline -- 67 Fed. Reg. 54735 2002