

**PART 11—CONSIGNMENT SALES**

**Par. 19.** The authority citation for part 11 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 49–50; 27 U.S.C. 202 and 205.

**Par. 20.** Section 11.5 is redesignated as § 11.6.

**Par. 21.** A new section 11.5 is added and reads as follows:

**§ 11.5 Delegations of the Director.**

Most of the regulatory authorities of the Director contained in this part 11 are delegated to appropriate ATF officers. These ATF officers are specified in ATF Order 1130.7, Delegation Order—Delegation of the Director's Authorities in 27 CFR Parts 6, 8, 10 and 11. ATF delegation orders, such as ATF Order 1130.7, are available to any interested person by mailing a request to the ATF Distribution Center, P.O. Box 5950, Springfield, Virginia 22150–5190, or by accessing the ATF web site (<http://www.atf.treas.gov/>).

**Par. 22.** Paragraph (b) of newly designated § 11.6 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 11.6 Administrative provisions.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) *Examination and subpoena.* Any appropriate ATF officer shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any documentary evidence of any person, partnership, or corporation being investigated or proceeded against. An appropriate ATF officer shall also have the power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all such documentary evidence relating to any matter under investigation, upon a satisfactory showing the requested evidence may reasonably be expected to yield information relevant to any matter being investigated under the Act.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Par. 23.** Section 11.11 is amended by removing the definition of “ATF officer” and by adding in alphabetical order a new definition of “appropriate ATF officer” to read as follows:

**§ 11.11 Meaning of terms.**

\* \* \* \* \*

*Appropriate ATF Officer.* An officer or employee of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) authorized to perform any functions relating to the administration or enforcement of this part by ATF Order 1130.7, Delegation Order—Delegation of the Director's Authorities in 27 CFR parts 6, 8, 10 and 11.

\* \* \* \* \*

Signed: May 18, 2000.

**Bradley A. Buckles,**  
*Director.*

Approved: June 21, 2000.

**John P. Simpson,**  
*Deputy Assistant Secretary (Regulatory, Tariff and Trade Enforcement).*

[FR Doc. 00–21901 Filed 8–25–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810–31–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 117**

**[CGD08–00–020]**

**RIN 2115–AE47**

**Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Red River, LA**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is removing the operating regulation for the State Route 107 vertical lift bridge across the Red River, mile 59.5, at Moncla, Louisiana. A new State Route 107 fixed bridge has opened and the vertical lift bridge has been removed from the waterway. The regulation governing the vertical lift bridge operation is no longer needed.

**DATES:** This regulation becomes effective on August 28, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents referred to in this notice are available for inspection or copying at the office of the Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch, Hale Boggs Federal Building, room 1313, 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130–3396 between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (504) 589–2965. Commander (ob) maintains the public docket for this rulemaking.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. David Frank, Bridge Administration Branch, telephone number 504–589–2965.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

A new State Route 107 fixed bridge across the Red River, mile 59.9, at Moncla, Louisiana, was opened to traffic in March of 2000. The old State Route 107 vertical lift bridge across the Red River, mile 59.5, was removed. The elimination of this drawbridge necessitates the removal of the drawbridge operation regulation that pertained to this draw. This rule

removes the regulation for this bridge in § 117.491(a).

The Coast Guard has determined that good cause exists under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553) to forgo notice and comment for this rulemaking because removing the bridge makes the need for the regulation unnecessary. The Coast Guard has also determined that good cause exists for the rule to become effective upon publication in the **Federal Register** as the bridge was removed in July, 2000.

**Regulatory Evaluation**

This final rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. It has not been reviewed 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 final 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 considers whether this final rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. “Small entities” include (1) small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and (2) governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

This rule will have no impact on either vehicular or navigational traffic because the regulation being removed applies to a bridge that has been removed. Because it will have no impact, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that it will not have any economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

**Collection of Information**

This final rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

**Federalism**

We have analyzed this final rule under Executive Order 13132 and have determined that this final rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

## Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) governs the issuance of Federal regulations that require unfunded mandates. An unfunded mandate is a regulation that requires a State, local, or tribal government or the private sector to incur direct costs without the Federal Government's having first provided the funds to pay those costs. This final rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

## Taking of Private Property

This final rule would not effect 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 final 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 final rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This final rule is not an economically significant rule and does not concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

## Environment

We considered the environmental impact of this final rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, this final rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. This final rule will change an existing special drawbridge operating regulation promulgated by a Coast Guard Bridge Administration Program action. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

## List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

## Regulations

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard is amending Part 117 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, 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; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 105 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.491(a) is revised to read as follows:

### § 117.491 Red River.

(a) The draw of the Union Pacific Railroad bridge, mile 90.1, at Alexandria, shall open on signal if at least eight hours notice is given.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: August 15, 2000.

**K. J. Eldridge,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, 8th Coast Guard District, Acting.*

[FR Doc. 00–21879 Filed 8–25–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 117

[CGD08–00–019]

RIN 2115–AE47

### Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Tickfaw River, LA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is removing the operating regulation for the State Route 22 swing bridge across the Tickfaw River, mile 7.2, at Killian, Louisiana. A new State Route 22 fixed bridge has opened and the swing bridge has been removed from the waterway. The regulation governing the swing bridge operation is no longer needed.

**DATES:** This regulation becomes effective on August 28, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents referred to in this notice are available for inspection or copying at the office of the Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch, Hale Boggs Federal Building, room 1313, 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130–3396 between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (504) 589–2965. Commander (ob) maintains the public docket for this rulemaking.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. David Frank, Bridge Administration Branch, telephone number 504–589–2965.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Background

A new State Route 22 fixed bridge across the Tickfaw River, mile 7.2, at Killian, Louisiana, was opened to traffic in March of 2000. The old State Route 22 swing bridge across the Tickfaw River, mile 7.2, was removed. The elimination of this drawbridge necessitates the removal of the drawbridge operation regulation that pertained to this draw. This rule removes the regulation for this bridge in § 117.506.

The Coast Guard has determined that good cause exists under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553) to forego notice and comment for this rulemaking because removing the bridge makes the need for the regulation unnecessary. The Coast Guard has also determined that good cause exists for the rule to become effective upon publication in the **Federal Register** as the bridge was removed in April, 2000.

### Regulatory Evaluation

This final 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 not been reviewed 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 final 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 considers whether this final rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. “Small entities” include (1) small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and (2) governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

This rule will have no impact on either vehicular or navigational traffic because the regulation being removed applies to a bridge that has been removed. Because it will have no impact, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that it will not have any economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.