Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. It has been exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is necessary.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this rule will have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' include 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.

Therefore, the Coast Guard certifies under section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as it will only affect anchored vessels in the waters off Port Everglades and the changes are minor in nature.

Collection of Information

This rule contains no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Federalism

The Coast Guard has analyzed this rule under the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612 and has determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Environmental Assessment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded under Figure 2–1, paragraph 34(f) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, that this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A Categorical Exclusion Determination has been prepared and is available in the docket for inspection or copying.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Coast Guard amends part 110 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 110—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471, 2030, 2035, and 2071; 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 1.05–1(g). Section 110.1a and each section listed in 110.1a is also issued under 33 U.S.C. 1223 and 1231.

2. Revise § 110.186(b) to read as follows:

§ 110.186 Port Everglades, Florida.

* * * * *

(b) *The regulations.*

(1) Commercial vessels in the Atlantic Ocean in the vicinity of Port Everglades shall anchor only within the anchorage area hereby defined and established, except in cases of emergency.

(2) Prior to entering the anchorage area, all vessels shall notify the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, via the Port Everglades Harbormaster, on VHF–FM Channel 14.

(3) All vessels within the anchorage area shall maintain a 24-hour bridge watch by an English speaking licensed deck officer monitoring VHF–FM channel 16. This individual shall perform frequent checks of the vessel's position to ensure the vessel is not dragging anchor.

(4) Vessels experiencing casualties such as a main propulsion, main steering or anchoring equipment malfunction or which are planning to perform main propulsion engine repairs or maintenance, shall immediately notify the Coast Guard Captain of the Port via the Coast Guard Group Miami on VHF–FM Channel 16.

(5) The Coast Guard Captain of the Port may close the anchorage area and direct vessels to depart the anchorage during periods of adverse weather or at other times as deemed necessary in the interest of port safety.

(6) Commercial vessels anchoring under emergency circumstances outside the anchorage area shall shift to new positions within the anchorage area immediately after the emergency ceases.

Dated: April 13, 1999.

G.W. Sutton,

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

[FR Doc. 99–10429 Filed 4–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD 08–99–016]

Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, LA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

SUMMARY: The Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District, has issued a temporary deviation from the regulation governing the operation of the Norfolk Southern Railroad bascule span drawbridge across the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, mile 4.5, at New Orleans, Orleans Parish, Louisiana. This deviation allows the Port of New Orleans to close the bridge to navigation from 8 a.m. until noon and from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m., Monday through Friday from May 17, 1999 through May 28, 1999. This temporary deviation is issued to allow for the replacement of the railroad ties on the bascule span deck. The draw will open at any time for a vessel in distress. Presently, the draw opens on signal at all times.

DATES: This deviation is effective from 8 a.m. on May 17, 1999 through 5 p.m. on May 28, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Unless otherwise indicated, documents referred to in this notice are available for inspection or copying at the office of the Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch, Commander (ob), Eighth Coast Guard District, 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana, 70130–3396. The Bridge Administration Branch of the Eighth Coast Guard District maintains the public docket for this temporary deviation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Phil Johnson, Bridge Administration Branch, telephone (504) 589–2965.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Norfolk Southern Railroad bascule span drawbridge across the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Louisiana, has a vertical clearance of one foot above mean high water in the closed-to-navigation position and unlimited clearance in the open-to-navigation position. Navigation on the waterway consists of tugs with tows, fishing vessels, sailing vessels, and other recreational craft. The Port of New Orleans requested a temporary deviation from the normal operation of the drawbridge in order to accommodate the maintenance work, involving removal and replacement of the railroad ties on the bascule span deck.

The District Commander has, therefore, issued a deviation from the regulations in 33 CFR 117.5 authorizing the draw of the Norfolk Southern Railroad bascule span drawbridge across the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, mile 4.5, at New Orleans, Orleans Parish, Louisiana to remain closed to navigation from 8 a.m. until noon and from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m., Monday through Friday from May 17, 1999 through May 28, 1999.

Dated: April 14, 1999.

Paul J. Pluta,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Commander Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 99–10430 Filed 4–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–M

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 20

Changes in International Postal Rates

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service, after considering the comments submitted in response to its request published in the **Federal Register** on December 4, 1998 (63 FR 67017–67026), for comments on proposed changes in international postage rates, hereby gives notice that it is implementing the proposed rates, except as explained below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 12:01 a.m., Sunday, May 30, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Alepa, (202) 268–4071 and John Reynolds, (202) 314–7334.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 4, 1998, the Postal Service published in the **Federal Register** a notice of proposed changes in international postage rates (63 FR 67017–67026). The Postal Service requested comments by January 4, 1999, and by that date received two comments: one from a private individual and one from a mailer using printed matter services.

Comments from the private individual expressed concern about rate relationships. The commenter identified five specific areas of interest.

First, it was suggested that there should be some equivalence in the postage rates for outbound international mail sent to Canada and Mexico. While this observation may appear intuitively correct, it is premised on the assumption that the cost basis for setting rates to Canada and Mexico are similar. On previous occasions, the Postal Service has addressed this concern indicating that the cost of providing international mail service to Canada and Mexico are each influenced by the cost of delivery assessed separately by each of the two administrations, and that their respective delivery costs are not the same. In addition, transportation cost, length of haul, and associated handling costs incurred to provide service to each of these destinations also differ. These cost differences underlie the rate differences in the proposed rate levels.

Second, the commenter questioned the rate relationships between letters and printed matter, asserting that they too, should be the same. The rates differences as proposed are the result of different mark-ups applied to the costs of providing letter and printed matter services and the market factors that influence them.

Third, the commenter noted the existence of cross-overs between air and surface parcel post rates. This condition is acknowledged and is attributed solely to the cost of providing the respective services. Because of the lower volume of surface parcels, non-transportation processing costs tend to be higher for surface parcels than the comparable processing costs for air parcels. These costs differences are reflected in the rate levels proposed, and in part are also influenced by the average parcel weight for the two services.

Fourth, the commenter asserted the belief that rate differences between weight steps for a given service should be uniform. Particular emphasis on this issue was directed to International Express Mail Service (EMS). Rate design does not require that differences between weight steps be uniform. Flexibility to design rates that have a taper effect better aligns rate levels with market characteristics, and takes into account, in this instance, the presence of document and merchandise within the same product stream. Where certain cross-overs between Global Priority Mail (GPM) and EMS appeared in the notice published on December 4, 1998 in section I A at 63 FR 67018, they have been revised such that the EMS rate is greater.

Fifth, the commenter did question the consistency in the proposed differences for the Bulk Letter Service to Canada and the corresponding single piece letter rates to Canada; namely, it is three or five cents. The published notice on December 4, 1998 contained an error in section IIB at 63 FR 67020. The difference between the Bulk Letter Service to Canada and the corresponding single piece letter rates is five cents.

The Postal Service is also modifying the notice published on December 4, 1998, in section IV A and IV B at 63 FR 67020 with respect to GPM. The rates for Canada also apply to Mexico. The rates applicable to all other countries, therefore, do not apply to Mexico.

The mailer using surface printed matter and publishers' periodical rates provide three main concerns. First, comment on the general size of the rate increase being proposed was offered. While the overall rate increase proposed for international mail is 3.3 percent, this mailer noted that he was facing a much larger increase. The rate levels for printed matter and publishers' periodicals are primarily the result of cost increases resulting from revisions in terminal dues. Second, this mailer gave his endorsement to the proposed drop ship rates for publishers' periodicals. The mailer observed that being able to take advantage of the drop ship option would lower his effective rate increase to levels equivalent to the domestic rate increases. Lastly, the mailer expressed concern that international mail rate changes may be timed with the January 10, 1999, implementation date for domestic postage and fee changes and therefore could be burdensome. The mailer suggested a later implementation date suggesting July 1, 1999 as a possibility. The Postal Service believes that the implementation date announced in this final rule is sensitive to this concern.

The notice published on December 4, 1998 contained errors. In section V C, Publishers' Periodicals, located at 63 FR 67021 the 3-pound weight was given as 2 pounds. In section VE 1, Air-Other Articles, located at 63 FR 67021 the rate for Mexico for 2 ounces is $1.07, not $0.89. In section VI B, Air Parcel Post, located at 63 FR 67022 the 1-pound rate for Canada is $12.61 since there is a 1-pound minimum weight for parcels to that country. It should be noted that, with the exception of air letter rates to Canada, the Postal Service is not changing air letter rates to the rest of the world.

After reviewing and considering the comments received, the Postal Service adopts the following postage rates and amends the International Mail Manual (IMM), which is incorporated by reference in the Code of Federal Regulations. See 39 CFR 20.1.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 20

Foreign relations, Incorporation by reference, International postal services.