the operators station would meet this requirement.

(2) *Means to Visually Inspect the Locking Mechanism:*

There must be a visual means of directly inspecting the locks. Where all locks are tied to a common lock shaft, a means of inspecting the locks at each end may be sufficient to meet this requirement provided no failure condition in the lock shaft would go undetected when viewing the end locks. Viewing latches may be used as an alternate to viewing locks on some installations where there are other compensating features.

(3) *Means to Prevent Pressurization:*

All doors must have provisions to prevent initiation of pressurization of the airplane to an unsafe level, if the door is not fully closed, latched and locked.

(4) *Lock Strength:*

Locks must be designed to withstand the maximum output power of the actuators and maximum expected manual operating forces treated as a limit load. Under these conditions, the door must remain closed, latched and locked.

(5) *Power Availability:*

All power to the door must be removed in flight and it must not be possible for the flight crew to restore power to the door while in flight.

(6) *Powered Lock Systems:*

For doors that have powered lock systems, it must be shown by safety analysis that inadvertent opening of the door after it is fully closed, latched and locked, is extremely improbable.''

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 4, 1999.

D.L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–29473 Filed 11–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

24 CFR Part 990

[Docket No. FR–4425–N–07]

Negotiated Rulemaking Committee on Operating Fund Allocation; Meetings

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD.

ACTION: Negotiated Rulemaking Committee Meetings.

SUMMARY: This document announces a meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee on Operating Fund Allocation. These meetings are sponsored by HUD for the purpose of discussing and negotiating a proposed rule that would change the current method of determining the payment of operating subsidies to public housing agencies (PHAs).

DATES: The committee meeting will be held on November 30, December 1, and December 2, 1999.

On November 30, 1999, the meeting will begin at approximately 2:00 pm and end at approximately 6:00 pm. On December 1, 1999, the meeting will begin at approximately 9:00 am and end at approximately 5:30 pm. On December 2, 1999, the meeting will begin at approximately 9:00 am and end at approximately 4:00 pm.

ADDRESSES: The committee meeting will take place at the Holiday Inn On-the-Hill, 415 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20001; telephone (202) 638–1616.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Sprague, Acting Director, Funding and Financial Management Division, Public and Indian Housing, Room 4216, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410–0500; telephone (202) 708–1872 (this telephone number is not toll-free). Hearing or speech-impaired individuals may access this number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Secretary of HUD has established the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee on Operating Fund Allocation to negotiate and develop a proposed rule that would change the current method of determining the payment of operating subsidies to PHAs. The establishment of the committee is required by the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 105–276, approved October 21, 1998) (the ''Public Housing Reform Act''). The Public Housing Reform Act makes extensive changes to HUD's public and assisted housing programs. These changes include the establishment of an Operating Fund for the purpose of making assistance available to PHAs for the operation and management of public housing. The Public Housing Reform Act requires that the assistance to be made available from the new Operating Fund be determined using a formula developed through negotiated rulemaking procedures.

II. Negotiated Rulemaking Committee Meeting

This document announces a meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee on Operating Fund Allocation. The next committee meeting will take place as described in the **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

The agenda planned for the committee meeting includes: (1) Work group sessions to discuss various issues related to the implementation of an Operating Fund formula; (2) full committee discussions of the work-products developed by the work groups; (3) development of draft regulatory language; and (4) the scheduling of future meetings, if necessary.

The meetings will be open to the public without advance registration. Public attendance may be limited to the space available. Members of the public may make statements during the meeting, to the extent time permits, and file written statements with the committee for its consideration. Written statements should be submitted to the address listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION** section of this notice. Summaries of committee meetings will be available for public inspection and copying at the address in the same section.

Dated: November 5, 1999.

Harold Lucas,

Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

[FR Doc. 99–29497 Filed 11–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–33–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD 11–99–013]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: At the request of a local citizen, the Coast Guard is considering a change in operating regulations for the drawbridges crossing the Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal (Oakland Estuary), between Oakland and Alameda, California. The proposal would amend the existing operating regulations to adjust the commute hour closures to coincide with current peak traffic periods.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 11, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed or hand-delivered to: Commander (oan), Eleventh Coast Guard District, Bldg. 50–6, Coast Guard Island, Alameda, CA 94501–5100. Comments may also be faxed to: (510) 437–5836. Comments may be e-mailed to:

jolmes@d11.uscg.mil. Comments may be delivered to the above address between 6:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday except Federal holidays.

The Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerry Olmes, Bridge Administrator, at the address above. His telephone number is (510) 437–3515.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Requests for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments for or against the proposed change. Persons submitting comments should identify this rulemaking (CGD 11–99–013) and the specific section of this document to which each comment applies. Give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ × 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose a stamped, self addressed postcard or envelope. All comments and other materials referenced in this notice will be available for inspection and copying at the Coast Guard address given above. Normal office hours are between 6:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. The Coast Guard plans no public hearing. Persons may request a public hearing by writing to the Coast Guard including the reasons why a hearing would be beneficial. If it is determined that the opportunity for oral presentations will aid in this rulemaking, the Coast Guard will hold a public hearing at time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

The proposed regulation may be changed in light of comments received. All comments received before the expiration of the comment period will be considered before final action is taken on the NPRM. The Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District, will evaluate all comments received and determine a course of final action on this proposal.

Background and Purpose

The current regulation, 33 CFR 117.181, specifies that the bridges need not open for the passage of vessels from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and 3:45 p.m. to 5:45 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. This regulation was enacted in 1973 to accommodate peak highway traffic periods. However, a recent analysis of traffic data reveals that the peak morning commute period is now from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and the afternoon peak is from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. The proposed change should better accommodate peak highway traffic with no additional impact on vessel traffic, although vessel operators will have to adjust their travel times. Vessel traffic is light on weekdays; the bridges typically open about 4 times each day during daylight hours. Vessel operators should be able to adjust their time of passage without significant economic consequences.

The Coast Guard also proposes to amend the waterway mileages listed in the regulation to coincide with current practice.

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 Department of Transportation Regulatory Policies and Procedures (DOT) (44 FR 11040, February 26, 1979). The only impact would be on the larger vessels not able to pass under the closed bridge, and they will have the same access as they do presently, but will have a slightly modified schedule of closed periods. The Coast Guard expects the impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. § 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposal will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' may include small businesses and not-for profit organizations that are not dominant in their respective fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations less than 50,000. For the same reasons set forth in the Regulatory Evaluation, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b) that this proposal, if adopted, is not expected to have a significant economic impact on any substantial number of entities, regardless of their size.

Assistance for Small Entities

In accordance with § 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), the Coast Guard wants to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rule making process. If your small business or organization is affected by this rule and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Jerry Olmes, Coast Guard Bridge Section, Alameda office at the address listed in **ADDRESSES.**

Collection of Information

This proposal 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 proposal in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 13132 and has determined that this proposal does not have federalism implications under this Order.

Environmental Assessment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this proposal and concluded that under Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, Figure 2–1, paragraph 32(e), this proposal is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation, because it is a Bridge Administration Program action involving the promulgation of operating requirements or procedures for a drawbridge.

Unfunded Mandates

Under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub L. 104–4), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposed rule will result in an annual expenditure by state, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate of $100 million (adjusted annually for inflation). If so, the Act requires that a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives be considered, and that from those alternatives, the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objective of the rule be selected.

No state, local or tribal government entities will be affected by this rule, so this rule will not result in annual or aggregate costs of $100 million or more. Therefore, the Coast Guard is exempt from any further regulatory requirements under the Unfunded Mandates Act.

Other Executive Orders on the Regulatory Process

In addition to the statutes and Executive Orders already addressed in this preamble, the Coast Guard considered the following executive orders in developing this rule and reached the following conclusions:

E.O 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights. This Rule will not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under this Order.

E.O. 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. This Rule will not impose, on any State, local, or tribal government, a mandate that is not required by statute and that is not funded by the Federal government.

E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This Rule meets applicable standards in section 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of this Order to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This Rule is not an economically significant rule and does not concern an environmental risk to safety disproportionately affecting children.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Proposed Regulation

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend part 117 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 117—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of P.L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.181 is revised to read as follows:

§ 117.181 Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal.

The draws of the Alameda County highway bridges at Park Street, mile 5.2; Fruitvale Avenue, mile 5.6; and High Street, mile 6.0; and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers railroad bridge, mile 5.6 at Fruitvale Avenue, shall open on signal; except that, from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday except Federal holidays, the draws need not be opened for the passage of vessels. However, the draws shall open during the above closed periods for vessels which must, for reasons of safety, move on a tide or slack water, if at least two hours notice is given. The draws shall open as soon as possible for vessels in distress and emergency vessels, including commercial vessels engaged in rescue or emergency salvage operations.

Dated: October 21, 1999.

T.H. Collins,

Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 99–29603 Filed 11–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

36 CFR Parts 5 and 13

RIN 1024–AC58

National Park System Units in Alaska; Denali National Park and Preserve, Special Regulations

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: For National Park System units in Alaska, the proposed rule would establish a definition for ''traditional activities'' as the term is used in Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and in the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. The rule would close the area within Denali National Park that was formerly Mount McKinley National Park to the use of snowmachines (snowmobiles) for traditional activities. The rule would also consolidate, expand and codify certain designations, closures, and permit requirements for Denali National Park and Preserve. This proposal includes requirements for vehicular traffic, vehicle use limits, public health and safety, and resource protection postings and closures. It also replaces the out-of-date references to ''Mount McKinley National Park'' with the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act name ''Denali National Park and Preserve.'' The National Park Service (NPS) will hold hearings in the vicinity of the Park concerning the proposed closure to snowmachines and the other portions of this proposed rule. NPS will analyze all timely comments, modify the Rule as needed and publish a Final Rule in early 2000.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted through January 11, 2000. Commenters are advised that the Department of the Interior intends to make the names and addresses of commenters public, but that commenters may request that this information not be released and the Department will then determine whether the information may be withheld under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

ADDRESSES: Address comments to: Superintendent, Denali National Park and Preserve, PO Box 9, Denali National Park, AK 99755. Attention: Ken Kehrer, Jr.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken Kehrer, Jr. at the above address or by calling 907–683–2294.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Denali National Park and Preserve is a vast area that provides visitors of all abilities with opportunities for superlative, inspirational, recreational, wilderness, and wildlife experiences in keeping with its legislative mandates. Over the long term, preserving the wilderness, and its continually evolving natural processes, is essential to ensuring opportunities for outstanding resource-based visitor experiences.

In the NPS Organic Act of 1916, Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior and the NPS to manage national parks and monuments to ''conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.'' 16 U.S.C. 1. The Organic Act also granted the Secretary the authority to implement ''rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the use and management of the parks, monuments and reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.'' 16 U.S.C. 3. In 1917, Congress established Mount McKinley National Park to ''set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people * * * for recreation purposes by the public and for the preservation of animals, birds, and fish and for the preservation of the natural curiosities and scenic beauties thereof * * * said park shall be, and is hereby established as a game refuge'' (39 Stat. 938).

In 1980, Congress passed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), which enlarged Mt. McKinley National Park and renamed it Denali National Park and Preserve. P.L. 96–487, Dec. 2, 1980, 94 Stat. 2371. Consistent with the 1917 Act that created the park, ANILCA recognized the importance of protecting habitat for, and populations of, fish and wildlife. The legislative history of ANILCA states that certain NPS units in Alaska,