

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on July 12, 2000.  
**Christopher R. Blum,**  
*Manager, Air Traffic Division.*  
 [FR Doc. 00-18887 Filed 7-25-00; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 71**

[Airspace Docket No. 00-AGL-02]

**Modification of Class E Airspace; Marquette, MI**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.  
**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action modifies Class E airspace at Marquette, MI. An Area Navigation (RNAV) Standard Instrument Approach Procedure (SIAP) to Runway (Rwy) 19 has been developed for Sawyer International Airport. Controlled airspace extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth is needed to contain aircraft executing this approach. This action increases that portion of the existing Class E airspace which extends upward from 1,200 feet above the surface of the earth for Sawyer International Airport.  
**EFFECTIVE DATE:** 0901 UTC, October 5, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Denis C. Burke, Air Traffic Division, Airspace Branch, AGL-520, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018; telephone (847) 294-7568.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**History**

On Friday, May 5, 2000, the FAA proposed to amend 14 CFR part 71 to modify Class E airspace at Marquette, MI (65 FR 26158). The proposal was to modify controlled airspace extending upward from the 700 feet above the surface to contain Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations in controlled airspace during portions of the terminal operation and while transiting between the enroute and terminal environments.

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. Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9G dated September 1, 1999,

and effective September 16, 1999, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

**The Rule**

This amendment to 14 CFR part 71 modifies Class E airspace at Marquette, MI, to accommodate aircraft executing instrument flight procedures into and out of Sawyer International Airport. The area will be depicted on appropriate aeronautical charts.

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. Therefore, this regulation—(1) is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866; (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**

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

**Adoption of the Amendment**

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

**PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, CLASS B, CLASS C, CLASS D, AND CLASS E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIRWAYS; ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS**

1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 95665, 3 CFR 1959-1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9G, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 1, 1999, and effective September 16, 1999, is amended as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

*Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**AGL MI E5 Marquette, MI [Revised]**

Marquette, Sawyer International Airport, MI (Lat. 46°21'13" N., Long. 87°23'45" W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within an 7.1-mile radius of the Sawyer International Airport, and that airspace extending upward from 1,200 feet above the surface within an area bounded on the north by latitude 47°05'00" N., on the east by longitude 86°23'30" W., on the south by latitude 45°45'00" N., and on the east by V9; excluding all Federal Airways, Hancock, MI, Escanaba, MI, and Iron Mountain, MI, Class E airspace areas.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on July 10, 2000.

**Christopher R. Blum,**  
*Manager, Air Traffic Division.*  
 [FR Doc. 00-18893 Filed 7-25-00; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Bureau of Export Administration**

**15 CFR Part 744**

[Docket No. 981019261-0207-03]  
**RIN 0694-AB73**

**Export Administration Regulations Entity List: Revisions to the Entity List**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Export Administration, Commerce.  
**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** On November 19, 1998, the Bureau of Export Administration (BXA) published a rule in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 64322) that added certain Indian and Pakistani entities to the Entity List in the Export Administration Regulations (EAR). Further revisions were made to the list of Indian entities on March 17, 2000 (65 FR 14444). This rule removes two Indian entities: the Nuclear Science Centre located in New Delhi and the Uranium Recovery Plant located in Cochin; and adds one Indian entity: Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO), Telemetry, Tracking and Command Network (ISTRAC) to the Entity List.

**DATES:** This rule is effective July 26, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eileen M. Albanese, Director, Office of Exporter Services, Bureau of Export Administration, Telephone: (202) 482-0436.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

In accordance with section 102(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, President Clinton reported to the Congress on May 13, 1998, with regard to India and May 30, 1998, with regard to Pakistan his determinations that those non-nuclear weapon states had each detonated a nuclear explosive device. The President directed in the determination reported to the Congress that the relevant agencies and instrumentalities of the United States take the necessary actions to implement the sanctions described in section 102(b)(2) of that Act. Consistent with the President's directive, the Bureau of Export Administration (BXA) implemented certain sanctions, as well as certain supplementary measures to enhance the sanctions on November 19, 1998 (63 FR 64322).

Based on a consensus decision by the Administration to more tightly focus the sanctions on those Indian entities which make direct and material contributions to weapons of mass destruction and missile programs and items that can contribute to such programs, BXA issued revisions to the list of Indian entities on March 17, 2000 (65 FR 14444). This rule makes additional revisions to the list by removing the Nuclear Science Centre located in New Delhi from the Entity List table in Supplement No. 4 to part 744. In addition, this rule removes the Uranium Recovery Plant located in Cochin from the subordinates listed under the Indian organization Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) in Appendix A to the Entity List, "Listed Subordinates of Listed Indian Organizations." Lastly, this rule adds the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO), Telemetry, Tracking and Command Network (ISTRAC) to subordinates listed under the Indian organization Department of Space (DOS) in Appendix A to the Entity List.

The license review policy for ISTRAC will be one of denial for items controlled for NP or MT reasons, except items intended for the preservation of safety of civil aircraft, which will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis; and computers, which will be reviewed with a presumption of denial. All other items subject to the EAR to ISTRAC will be reviewed with a presumption of denial, with the exception of items classified as EAR99, which will be reviewed with a presumption of approval.

The removal of entities from the Entity List does not relieve exporters or reexporters of their obligations under General Prohibition 5 in § 736.2(b)(5) of the EAR which provides that, "you may not, without a license, knowingly export

or reexport any item subject to the EAR to an end-user or end-use that is prohibited by part 744 of the EAR." BXA strongly urges the use of Supplement No. 3 to part 732 of the EAR, "BXA's 'Know Your Customer' Guidance and Red Flags" when exporting or reexporting to India and Pakistan.

Although the Export Administration Act (EAA) expired on August 20, 1994, the President invoked the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and continued in effect the EAR, and, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the EAA in Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, as extended by the President's notices of August 15, 1995 (60 FR 42767), August 14, 1996 (61 FR 42527), August 13, 1997 (62 FR 43629), August 13, 1998 (63 FR 44121), and August 10, 1999 (64 FR 44101, August 13, 1999).

## Rulemaking Requirements

1. This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of E.O. 12866.

2. This rule contains and involves collections of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). These collections have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0694-0088, "Multi-Purpose Application," which carries a burden hour estimate of 40 minutes to prepare and submit electronically and 45 minutes to submit manually on form BXA-748P; and 0694-0111, "India Pakistan Sanctions," which carries a burden hour estimate of 40 minutes to prepare and submit electronically and 45 minutes to submit manually on form BXA-748P. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

3. This rule does not contain policies with Federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a Federalism assessment under Executive Order 13132.

4. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553) requiring notice of proposed rulemaking, the opportunity for public participation, and a delay in effective date, are inapplicable because this regulation involves a military and foreign affairs function of the United States (see 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1)). Further, no other law requires that a notice of proposed rulemaking and an

opportunity for public comment be given for this final rule. Because a notice of proposed rulemaking and an opportunity for public comment are not required to be given for this rule under 5 U.S.C. 553 or by any other law, the analytical requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) are not applicable.

Therefore, this regulation is issued in final form. Although there is no formal comment period, public comments on this regulation are welcome on a continuing basis. Comments should be submitted to Sharron Cook, Regulatory Policy Division, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, PO Box 273, Washington, DC 20044.

## List of Subjects in 15 CFR Part 744

Exports, Foreign trade, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, part 744 of the Export Administration Regulations (15 CFR parts 730 through 799) is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 15 CFR part 744 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 50 U.S.C. app. 2401 *et seq.*; 50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*; 22 U.S.C. 3201 *et seq.*; 42 U.S.C. 2139a; E.O. 12058, 43 FR 20947, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 179; E.O. 12851, 58 FR 33181, 3 CFR, 1993 Comp., p. 608; E.O. 12924, 59 FR 43437, 3 CFR, 1994 Comp., p. 917; E.O. 12938, 59 FR 59099, 3 CFR, 1994 Comp., p. 950; E.O. 13026, 61 FR 58767, 3 CFR, 1996 Comp., p. 228; Notice of November 12, 1998, 63 FR 63589, 3 CFR, 1998 Comp., p. 305; Notice of August 10, 1999, 64 FR 44101, 3 CFR, 1999 Comp., p.302.

## PART 744—[AMENDED]

2. Supplement No. 4 to part 744 is amended by:

a. Removing the entity "Nuclear Science Centre (NSC), New Delhi" from "India" in the table;

b. Removing "Uranium Recovery Plant, Cochin" from the subordinates listed under the Indian organization "Department of Atomic Energy (DAE)" in Appendix A, Listed Subordinates of Listed Indian Organizations; and

c. Adding in alphabetical order the entity "Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO), Telemetry, Tracking and Command Network (ISTRAC)" to the subordinates listed under the Indian organization "Department of Space (DOS)" in Appendix A to Supplement No. 4 to part 744 A, Listed Subordinates of Listed Indian Organizations.

Dated: July 18, 2000.

**R. Roger Majak,**

*Assistant Secretary for Export Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-18820 Filed 7-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-33-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 15 CFR Part 902

#### 50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 990713190-0155-02; I.D. 041599B]

RIN 0648-AH63

### Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Amendment 1 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Spiny Dogfish Fishery Management Plan

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Final rule; technical amendment.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS issues this final rule to implement approved measures contained in Amendment 1 (Amendment 1) to the Fishery Management Plan for the Atlantic Bluefish Fishery (FMP). Amendment 1 contains a number of measures requiring regulatory implementation to control fishing mortality on Atlantic bluefish (bluefish). This rule implements permit and reporting requirements for commercial vessels, dealers, and party/charter boats; implements permit requirements for bluefish vessel operators; establishes a Bluefish Monitoring Committee (Committee) charged with annually recommending to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) the total allowable landings (TAL) and other restrictions necessary to achieve the target fishing mortality rates (F) specified in the FMP; establishes a framework adjustment process; establishes a 9-year stock rebuilding schedule; establishes a commercial quota with state allocations; and establishes a recreational harvest limit. The purpose of this rule is to control fishing mortality of bluefish and rebuild the stock. Also, this rule makes technical amendments to the regulations implementing the Spiny Dogfish Fishery

Management Plan. In addition, this rule makes technical amendments to crossreferencing regulations managing the American lobster fishery. Furthermore, NMFS informs the public of the approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) of the collection-of-information requirements contained in this rule and publishes the OMB control numbers for these collections.

**DATES:** This rule is effective August 25, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of Amendment 1, its Regulatory Impact Review, the Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA), and the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) are available from Daniel T. Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Room 2115, Federal Building, 300 South New Street, Dover, DE 19901-6790.

Comments regarding the collection-of-information requirements contained in this final rule should be sent to Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Northeast Regional Office, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930, and to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 (Attention: NOAA Desk Officer).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Myles Raizin, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978-281-9104.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This final rule implements the measures to control fishing mortality of bluefish contained in Amendment 1, which were approved by NMFS on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) on July 29, 1999. Amendment 1 also addresses the new requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act. Two primary examples of these requirements are establishing a rebuilding plan to rebuild the bluefish stock from an overfished condition and describing and identifying essential fish habitat (EFH) for bluefish. As part of the rebuilding plan, Amendment 1 contains a new overfishing definition for the bluefish stock and a 9-year rebuilding schedule. The rebuilding plan was also approved by NMFS. The overfishing definition is not being codified in regulations. NMFS did not approve all of Amendment 1. NMFS disapproved the *de minimus* provision related to state allocations of the commercial quota, the portion of the essential fish habitat (EFH) section assessing the effects of fishing gear on bluefish EFH,

and the description and analysis of fishing communities. All of the other measures contained in Amendment 1, as originally submitted, were approved. A proposed rule to implement these measures was published on August 23, 1999 (64 FR 45938).

The *de minimus* provision, which would have exempted states receiving less than 0.1 percent of the overall allocation from participating in the state allocation system, was disapproved because it is inconsistent with National Standard 1 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which requires that management measures prevent overfishing. This provision lacks any clear obligation on the part of the *de minimus* state to close its commercial bluefish fishery once its quota is harvested. This could result in a state's *de minimus* quota being rapidly exceeded and could result in overfishing of the bluefish stock.

A portion of the EFH provisions were disapproved because Amendment 1 failed to list and to consider adequately the potential adverse impacts of all fishing gear used in the waters described as EFH, particularly those waters under state jurisdiction. A significant portion of bluefish EFH occurs within state waters and the Council has indicated that there is some linkage between juvenile bluefish and submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV). Amendment 1 indicates that there are impacts to SAV from certain estuarine fishing gear. However, these gear are not listed in Section 2.2.3.6 (Fishing Gear Used Within the Bluefish Range), their potential impacts to bluefish EFH are not assessed in Section 2.2.3.7 (Fishing Impacts to Bluefish EFH), nor are the measures for managing potential adverse impacts considered in Section 2.2.4 (Options for Managing Adverse Effects from Fishing). These three sections of the EFH designation in the amendment were, therefore, disapproved.

The description and analysis of fishing communities was disapproved because the communities involved in the present day fishery are not sufficiently identified and the amendment does not describe or consider impacts on recreational fishing communities, such as Ocean City, Maryland, Virginia Beach, Virginia, or Oregon Inlet, North Carolina. The fishing communities section of Amendment 1 is based on the 1993 surveys of the Mid-Atlantic commercial fishing communities by McCay et al. Dependence of communities on the fishery is not assessed or considered, and the requirements of section 303(a)(9) and national standard 8 are not satisfied.