accompany the desired system improvement without the establishment of V—347. Therefore, V—287 and V—349 will now be aligned to coincide with the airway track as proposed in the NPRM. The airway designations will change to reflect the removal of V—347. This action will facilitate new departure procedures at Bellingham, WA, and improve the airway system in the Puget Sound area. Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments objecting to the proposal were received. Section 71.123 of part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations was republished in Handbook 7400.6C dated September 4, 1990.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations will alter the descriptions of V—287 and V—349 from the Paine VORTAC located in the State of Washington. This amendment will facilitate new departure procedures at Bellingham and improve the airway system in the Puget Sound area. Studies conducted by the FAA Northwest Mountain Flight Standards and Air Traffic offices indicate that the alteration of V—287 and V—349 will accomplish the desired system improvement without the establishment of V—347. This action will realign V—287 and V—349 to coincide with the relocation of the Paine VORTAC. The regulatory description of V—23 will remain the same although the bearings between Bellingham and the Paine VORTAC have changed to reflect this relocation. This action is to improve traffic flow, increase aircraft safety, and reduce controller workload.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a “major rule” under Executive Order 12291; (2) is not a “significant rule” under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Aviation safety, VOR Federal airways.

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF AIRWAYS, AREA LOW ROUTI CONTROLLED AIRSPACE, AN REPORTING POINTS

1. The authority citation for § 71.123 continues to read as follows:


§ 71.123 [Amended] 2. § 71.123 is amended as follows:

V—287 [Amended]

By removing the Words “INT Olympia 010” and Paine, WA, 257” radiials;” and substituting the words “INT Olympia 010” and Paine, WA, 254” radiials; Paine; INT Paine 329” and Bellingham, WA, 191” radiials; to Bellingham;”

V—349 [Revised]

From Seattle, WA; INT Seattle 329” and Bellingham, WA, 191” radiials; Bellingham; to Williams Lake, BC, Canada. The airspace within Canada is excluded.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 2, 1991.

Jerry W. Ball,
Acting Manager, Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division.
[FR Doc. 91-24465 Filed 10-6-91; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

14 CFR Part 91

[Docket No. 26433; Amendment No. 91-225]

RIN 2120-AD96

Transition to an All Stage 3 Fleet Operating in the 49 Continental United States and the District of Columbia.

Correction—FINAL RULE

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The final rule amending the airplane operating rules to require a phased transition to an all Stage 3 fleet operating in the 49 contiguous United States and the District of Columbia, published in the Federal Register on September 25, 1991 (56 FR 48026), contained minor errors. This document corrects those errors.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Mr. William Albee, Manager, Policy and Regulatory Division (AAEE-300), Office of Environment and Energy, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; (202) 267-3553.

none of which the FAA anticipates will have any substantial impact on persons affected by the final rule. These errors are discussed briefly below.

The first error occurred in § 91.855(f)(1)(ii), in which a comma between the words “trust” and “partnership” was omitted. The section tracks the language of § 9309(c)(1)(C) of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990.

The second error also occurred in § 91.855(f)(1)(iii); the correct cross reference is to (f)(1)(i) or (ii). not (g)(1)(i) or (ii).

The third error occurred in § 91.861(b), concerning the description of the base level for foreign air carriers. The words that were omitted in the publication of the final rule help to clarify the base level calculation for foreign air carriers.

The fourth error occurred in § 91.873(c) and is an unclear reference to “that section.” The reference is to the waiver provision itself.

The fifth error occurred in § 91.875(a) and refers to report certification by a carrier; the term should have been “operator.”

The sixth error occurred in § 91.879(c)(3), which contains a reference to reporting progress toward compliance with § 91.863. That reference should be to § 91.853.

Accordingly, in Federal Register document number 91-22950, published September 25, 1991, at 56 FR 48628, make the following corrections:

§ 91.855 [Corrected]

1. On page 48658, column 2, § 91.855, paragraph (f)(1)(ii), line 2, insert a comma between the words “trust” and “partnerships.”

2. On page 48658, column 3, § 91.855, paragraph (f)(1)(iii), lines 1 and 2, replace the cross reference “(g)(1)(i) or (ii)” with “(f)(1)(i) or (ii).”

§ 91.861 [Corrected]

3. On page 48659, column 1, § 91.861, paragraph (b) introductory text, line 4, the words “airplanes on U.S. operations” is corrected to read “airplanes that were listed on that carrier’s U.S. operations.”

§ 91.873 [Corrected]

4. On page 48660, column 2, § 91.873, paragraph (c), lines 5 and 6, replace the phrase “of that section” with the phrase “of this section.”
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
Customs Service
19 CFR Part 4
[T.D. 91-87]

Stevedoring Equipment and Materials—Coastwise Transportation on Non-Coastwise-Qualified Vessels

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service. Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final interpretive rule.

SUMMARY: This document clarifies and retains the long-standing Customs Service interpretation of one element of the coastwise merchandise transportation statute. An earlier published notice proposed to limit a benefit conferred by the statute solely to vessels carrying stevedoring equipment for use on the transporting vessel itself. Customs has concluded a review of the comments received and has determined not to change its position, but instead to clarify that position with regard to certain limited vessel chartering arrangements as well as the definition of stevedoring equipment and materials. No substantive change in the administration of the statute results from either of these clarifications.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry L. Burton, Carrier Rulings Branch, 202-560-5709.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

By publication in the Federal Register of May 25, 1980 (55 FR 21204), Customs proposed to change its position regarding the transportation of stevedoring equipment and material between coastwise points by non-qualified vessels. The cited notice solicited public comments on the proposed change which would have required that such equipment and material be used only to load and unload the transporting vessel.

Title 46, United States Code
Appendix, section 883 (40 U.S.C. app. 883), commonly called the Jones Act, provides, in part, that no merchandise shall be transported between points in the United States embraced within the coastwise laws, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, in any vessel other than a vessel built in and documented under the laws of the United States and owned by citizens of the United States. Section 883 was amended by the Act of September 21, 1965 (Pub. L. 89-194, 79 Stat. 823), which added the sixth proviso, and by the Act of August 11, 1968 (Pub. L. 90-474, 82 Stat. 700), which amended that proviso.

The 1965 Act exempted from the provisions of section 883 the coastwise transportation of empty cargo vans, empty lift vans, and empty shipping tanks in non-coastwise-qualified United States-flags vessels or foreign-flags vessels, on a reciprocal basis, when the vans and tanks are owned or leased by the owner or operator of the transporting vessel and are being transported for use in the carriage of cargo in foreign trade. The 1968 Act added equipment for use with cargo vans, lift vans, and empty shipping tanks, empty barges specifically designed for carriage aboard a vessel, and certain empty instruments of international traffic to the articles included within the sixth proviso. These articles and the articles covered by the 1965 Act were required by the 1968 Act to be owned or leased by the owner or operator of the transporting vessel and transported for his use in handling his cargo in foreign trade.

The 1968 Act also added stevedoring equipment and material to the articles included within the sixth proviso. To qualify for exemption from section 883 under the sixth proviso, the stevedoring equipment and material must be owned or leased by the owner or operator of the transporting vessel or owned or leased by the stevedoring company contracting for the loading or unloading of the vessel and the stevedoring equipment and material must be transported without charge for use in the handling of cargo in foreign trade.

In its interpretation of the sixth proviso insofar as it relates to stevedoring equipment and material, Customs has never taken the position that stevedoring equipment and material transported under the proviso is required to be used exclusively for loading or unloading the transporting vessel. In one ruling on this subject (File: VES-3-17-COR-P.R.C. 108629/109464 PH, July 21, 1988) Customs held that a vessel of a foreign country which grants reciprocal treatment to vessels of the United States and which was bareboat chartered by the owner of certain cranes, could be used to transport the cranes between United States points when those cranes were to be used to load and unload cargo of the owner of the cranes into or from vessels other than the specific vessel which transported the cranes.

Customs received a request on behalf of an owner and operator of United States-flags coastwise-qualified vessels to reverse this position and to issue a new interpretation of the sixth proviso under which stevedoring equipment and material transported under the sixth proviso must be employed exclusively for the purpose of loading and unloading the transporting vessel. The party requesting that action contended that the Customs position was inconsistent with the intent of the Congress in its enactment of the 1968 Act adding stevedoring equipment and material to the sixth proviso and that the proposed interpretation was consistent with expressed Congressional intent. It was urged that there are indications in the legislative history that the stevedoring equipment and material provision added to the sixth proviso by the 1968 Act was intended to apply to stevedoring equipment and material used to load and unload the vessel transporting the stevedoring equipment and material (114 Cong. Rec. 21480, 21481 (1968) (comments of Representatives Mailliard, Green, and Dellenback); H. Rep. No. 1712, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1968) (page 2, quoting the comments of the Department of Commerce); and Sen. Rep. No. 1465, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1968) (comments at 1968 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3183) (July 13, 1968, letter from General Counsel of the Department of Commerce)). It has also been suggested that there is language in the sixth proviso itself indicating that this was the intent of the provision relating to stevedoring equipment and material (i.e., "stevedoring equipment and material, if such equipment and material is owned or leased by the owner or operator of the transporting vessel, or is owned or leased by the stevedoring company contracting for the loading or unloading of that vessel **") (emphasis added).

Customs suspended the issuance of rulings on the issue during the pendency of notice and comment procedures. The view put forward for comment was that the stevedoring equipment and material provision added to the sixth proviso by the 1968 Act was intended to apply only...