

TABLE 1.—501–D13 SERIES LIFE LIMITS

Part name	Part number	Life limit for wheels that have complied with commercial overhaul information letter (COIL) 401, dated May 1978	Life limit for wheels that have not complied with COIL 401, dated May 1978
(1) Second-stage turbine wheel assembly.	6847142 and 6876892.	Remove from service before or upon accumulating 16,000 cycles-in-service (CIS).	Remove from service before or upon accumulating 12,000 CIS.
(2) Third-stage turbine wheel assembly.	6845883 and 6849743.	Remove from service before or upon accumulating 13,000 CIS.	Remove from service before or upon accumulating 10,000 CIS.
(3) Fourth-stage turbine wheel assembly.	6876468 .....	Remove from service before or upon accumulating 24,000 CIS.	Remove from service before or upon accumulating 18,000 CIS.

**501–D22 Series Engines**

(g) For 501–D22 series engines, remove turbine wheels and spacers from service as specified in the following Table 2:

TABLE 2.—501–D22 SERIES LIFE LIMITS

Part name	Part number	Remove from service
(1) Third-stage turbine wheel assembly.	6855083 .....	Before or upon accumulating 10,000 cycles-in-service (CIS).
(2) 1st–2nd-stage spacer assembly	6844632, 23033463, 23064854, and 23064858.	Before or upon accumulating 4,700 CIS.
(3) 1st–2nd-stage spacer assembly	23056966 .....	(i) Before or upon accumulating 8,000 CIS. (ii) If the 1st–2nd-stage spacer assembly passes the hardness criteria in RRC Commercial Engine Bulletin CEB–A–72–1135, then before or upon accumulating 10,000 CIS.
(4) 2nd–3rd-stage spacer assembly	23033456 .....	Before or upon accumulating 4,200 CIS.
(5) 2nd–3rd-stage spacer assembly	23033464 and 6842683 .....	Before or upon accumulating 5,200 CIS.
(6) 3rd–4th-stage spacer assembly	6844794 prior to revision letter "R"	Before or upon accumulating 5,100 CIS.

**Alternative Methods of Compliance**

(h) The Manager, Chicago Aircraft 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.

**Related Information**

(i) Information on 501–D13 series engine turbine life limits can be found in RRC Commercial Service Letter (CSL) No. CSL–120, Revision No. 52, dated July 22, 2002.

(j) Information on 501–D22 series engine turbine life limits can be found in RRC CSL No. CSL–1001, Revision No. 20, dated April 5, 2005.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on February 14, 2006.

**Ann C. Mollica,**

*Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
[FR Doc. E6–2454 Filed 2–21–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 117**

[CGD13–06–006]

**RIN 1625–AA09**

**Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Hoquiam River, WA**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily modify the drawbridge operation regulations for the Simpson Avenue Bridge across the Hoquiam River, mile 0.5, at Hoquiam, Washington. The proposed temporary change will enable the bridge owner to delay openings of the bridge from May 1, 2006, through June 1, 2007. This will facilitate major structural and mechanical rehabilitation of the bascule bridge.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before March 24, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments and related material to Commander (dpw), 13th Coast Guard District, 915 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98174–

1067 where the public docket for this rulemaking is maintained. 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 Waterways Management Branch between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Austin Pratt, Chief, Bridge Section, (206) 220–7282.

**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, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [CGD13–06–006], 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 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. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the Aids to Navigation and Waterways Management 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 proposed temporary rule would enable the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the owner of the bridge, to rehabilitate the structure and manage interruptions to this refurbishment caused by draw openings. The 2-hour notice requirement proposed as a temporary requirement from May 1, 2006, to June 1, 2007, would enable the work to proceed while still providing operational capability. Between January 2, 2007, and March 31, 2007, there is also proposed an 8-week period in which 24 hours notice would be required. The start and end dates are not yet known for this 8-week portion of the project. The 8-week period of 24-hour notice will be considered for approval and rulemaking via a separate temporary deviation. The work includes mechanical and electrical control system improvements, refurbishment of the center lock system, and the replacement of drive motors, the control building and maintenance access platforms. The eight weeks of testing the new control system will necessitate the 24-hour notice for openings.

The Simpson Avenue Bridge in the closed position provides 36 feet of vertical clearance above high water elevation 11.2 feet (datum mean lower low water 0.0). Drawbridge openings are not frequent at this location. The openings are mostly for recreational and commercial fishing vessels, rarely for sailboats and tugs.

The draw opened for vessels 144 times in 2004 for an average of almost 3 openings per week and 131 times in 2005 for a lesser weekly average.

### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The operating regulations currently in effect for the Simpson Avenue Bridge are found at 33 CFR 117.1047. The regulations require at least one hour notice at all times for draw openings.

One-hour notice is insufficient time for WSDOT and its contractors to restore the bridge to operational condition and to clear equipment from moving parts as

needed to open the span. As few vessels require openings, the increased notice of two hours proposed would not seem an unreasonable burden to vessel operators.

### 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.

With regards to the proposed temporary changes, we reached this conclusion based on the fact that most vessels will be able to plan transits in advance and being locally based will soon adjust to the temporary change.

### 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.

For the same reasons enumerated above, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

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 Austin Pratt, Chief, Bridge Section, at (206) 220–7282. 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 will 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 proposed 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 Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated this 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 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.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f), and have concluded 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, this proposed rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. There are no expected environmental consequences of the proposed action that would require further analysis and documentation.

### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117 Bridges.

### Regulations

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to temporarily 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; 33 CFR 1.05-1(g); Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102-587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. From May 1, 2006 to June 1, 2007, amend § 117.1047 by suspending paragraph (c) and adding paragraph (e) to read as follows:

#### § 117.1047 Hoquiam River.

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) From May 1, 2006 to June 1, 2007, the draw of the Simpson Avenue Bridge, mile 0.5, shall open on signal if at least 2 hours notice is given by marine radio, telephone, or other suitable means to the Washington Department of Transportation. The opening signal is two prolonged blasts followed by two short blasts.

Dated: February 3, 2006.

**R.R. Houck,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Thirteenth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. E6-2426 Filed 2-21-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

#### 38 CFR Part 21

RIN 2900-AL43

#### Administration of VA Educational Benefits—Centralized Certification

**AGENCY:** Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Withdrawal of proposed rule and promulgation of a new proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document withdraws the proposed rule, Administration of VA

Educational Benefits—Centralized Certification, published in the **Federal Register** on June 30, 2003 and promulgates a new proposed rule on the same subject. The new proposed rule would amend Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) rules governing certification of enrollment in approved courses for the training of veterans and other eligible persons under education benefit programs VA administers. Under this new proposed rule, VA would permit educational institutions with multi-state campuses to submit certifications to VA from a centralized location. VA considered comments received on the previous proposed rule when drafting this new proposed rule.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before April 24, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be submitted by: mail or hand-delivery to Director, Regulations Management (OOREG1), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Ave., NW., Room 1068, Washington, DC 20420; fax to (202) 273-9026; or e-mail through <http://www.Regulations.gov>. Comments should indicate that they are submitted in response to "RIN 2900-AL43." All comments received will be available for public inspection in the Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Room 1063B, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday (except holidays). Please call (202) 273-9515 for an appointment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lynn M. Nelson, Education Advisor, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs (225C), 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420, 202-273-7294.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 30, 2003, in 68 FR 38657, VA published a proposed rule that would have amended subpart D of 38 CFR part 21, regarding approval criteria for branches and extensions of educational institutions. Under the proposed rule, VA would have permitted educational institutions with multi-state campuses to submit required certifications from a centralized location. This document withdraws the proposed rule of June 30, 2003, 68 FR 38657. In its place, we are promulgating a new proposed rule concerning the same subject matter. Interested persons were given 60 days to submit comments on the initial proposed rule and VA considered those comments when drafting this new proposed rule. The differences between the now withdrawn proposed rule and the new proposed rule are explained below. In addition, this document addresses the public comments that VA