

Bombardier, Inc. (Formerly Canadair):
Docket No. FAA-2006-23936;
Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-215-AD.

Comments Due Date

(a) The FAA must receive comments on this AD action by March 20, 2006.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) airplanes, certificated in any category, serial numbers (S/N) 7003 and subsequent.

Unsafe Condition

(d) This AD results from a report of defective electrical relays affecting emergency equipment. We are issuing this AD to prevent the malfunction of emergency equipment (the passenger oxygen system, the thrust reverse control system, and the auxiliary power unit (APU) fire detection, warning, and extinguishing system) during an emergency.

Compliance

(e) You are responsible for having the actions required by this AD performed within the compliance times specified, unless the actions have already been done.

Service Bulletin References

(f) The term "service bulletin," as used in this AD, means the Accomplishment Instructions of Parts A through E of Bombardier Service Bulletin 601R-24-118, Revision A, dated August 8, 2005.

Relay Inspection

(g) Within 5,500 flight hours or 36 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever is first: Do an inspection of the manufacturer's date code on the K4WQ, K5WQ, K3QA, K4QA, K4WG, K1CN, and K2CN electrical relays, in accordance with the service bulletin, except as provided by paragraph (h) of this AD.

Alternative To Relay Inspection for Certain Airplanes

(h) For airplanes having S/Ns 7003 through 7363 inclusive, and 7889 and subsequent, which were not manufactured with the subject Leach TDH-series relays installed: A review of the airplane maintenance records is acceptable in lieu of the inspection of the manufacturer's date code on the K4WQ, K5WQ, K3QA, K4QA, K4WG, K1CN, and K2CN electrical relays, if the manufacturer's date code can be conclusively determined from that review.

Replacement of Identified Relays

(i) Prior to further flight: Replace any electrical relay having a manufacturer's date code specified in paragraph 1.A., "Effectivity," of the service bulletin that is identified during the inspection or maintenance records review specified in paragraph (g) or (h) of this AD with a serviceable relay, in accordance with the service bulletin.

Inspections and Replacements According to Previous Issue of Service Bulletin

(j) Inspecting and replacing the subject electrical relays is also acceptable for compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (g) and (i) of this AD, as applicable, if done before the effective date of this AD in accordance with Accomplishment Instructions of Parts A through E of Bombardier Service Bulletin 601R-24-118, dated January 3, 2005.

Parts Installation

(k) As of the effective date of this AD, no person may install a Leach TDH-series K4WQ, K5WQ, K3QA, K4QA, K4WG, K1CN, or K2CN relay with a manufacturer's date code specified in paragraph 1.A., "Effectivity," of the service bulletin on any airplane.

Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(l)(1) The Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested in accordance with the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(2) Before using any AMOC approved in accordance with § 39.19 on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify the appropriate principal inspector in the FAA Flight Standards Certificate Holding District Office.

Related Information

(m) Canadian airworthiness directive CF-2005-35, dated September 1, 2005, also addresses the subject of this AD.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 9, 2006.

Kalene C. Yanamura,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E6-2319 Filed 2-16-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

36 CFR Chapter I

Establishment of Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area

ACTION: Notice of establishment.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Interior is establishing the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management to negotiate and develop a special regulation for dog management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, in accordance with the Negotiated Rulemaking Act of 1990, 5 U.S.C. 564.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian O'Neill, General Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area,

Ft. Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, California 94123, 415-561-4720.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Secretary has determined that establishment of this Committee is in the public interest and supports the National Park Service in performing its duties and responsibilities under the NPS Organic Act, 16 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*; the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*; and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Act, 16 U.S.C. 460bb *et seq.*

In accordance with the Negotiated Rulemaking Act of 1990, 5 U.S.C. 564, a Notice of Intent to Establish a Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee was published in the **Federal Register** on June 28, 2005, providing a 30-day public comment period which concluded July 28, 2005. Three hundred thirty seven responses were received during the comment period.

Substantive Comments

Committee Additions

Comments suggested additions to the Committee which can be grouped into the following broad categories: Volunteer restoration groups, general park users not affiliated with any group, representation of adjacent governmental agencies, communities of color, disabled, additional dogwalkers associated with specific GGNRA sites and additional recreational user groups and advocates for narrowly-defined outcomes.

Response

The National Park Service is aware that a balanced Committee is necessary in order for discussions to be meaningful and fair. The Negotiated Rulemaking Procedure Act (U.S.C. Title 5, Part I, Chapter 5, Subchapter III) passed by Congress, states that a federal agency considering negotiated rulemaking must determine that there are a limited number of identifiable interests that will be significantly affected by the rule and that there is a reasonable likelihood that a committee can be convened with a balanced representation of persons who can adequately represent the interests identified. The Act also states that a federal agency can use the services of a "convener" to determine the above. NPS, working through the U.S. Institute of Environmental Conflict Resolution, hired the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) in March, 2004, and they subsequently assisted in identifying interests significantly affected by a proposed rule and representatives of those interests.

However, as a result of comments received, NPS has proposed replacing one of the two initially proposed equestrian representatives, who both belonged to groups in the north district of the park, with a representative of equestrian interests in the south district of the park. The NPS, with the approval of other Committee members, will work to bring a broad range of input to the Committee through membership on subcommittees, by presentations to the Committee and subcommittees and through the public comment period at each Committee meeting.

Committee Deletions

Comments were also received suggesting that some proposed members be removed. It was suggested the following representative groups be deleted: commercial dogwalkers, off-leash advocates (over-representation), representatives of those opposing any off-leash use in the park and those who are perceived as being unable to negotiate in good faith. In addition, the Presidio Trust has withdrawn from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee but stated that they will participate in the concurrent NEPA process.

Response

The Negotiated Rulemaking Act states that interests must be willing to negotiate in good faith to reach a consensus on the proposed rule. Even though recent activities surrounding this issue have raised emotions, all proposed committee members except one have recently reaffirmed willingness to move forward with the process. The one off-leash dogwalking representative who was unwilling to agree to good faith standards has been replaced by another off-leash representative who had been previously suggested for committee membership.

In the final, proposed committee membership, commercial dogwalkers, off-leash dogwalkers, and those opposing off-leash uses are all interest groups who use the park and are noted in the Notice of Intent as interest groups significantly affected by this issue and thus, must be involved in any meaningful discussions. Among the interest groups supporting off-leash dogwalking, there are a numerous viewpoints; in addition, the proposed committee membership has been selected to provide a balance of groups with shared interests. The proposed membership balances those shared interests of groups advocating voice control, groups representing the environment and representatives of other park user groups.

Committee Purpose and Process

Comments responded to a number of factors surrounding the establishment and scope of the Committee. Broadly categorized, the comments addressed: the NPS mandate to protect resources; the scope and sideboards for the Committee's discussions; the validity and effectiveness of the negotiated rulemaking process itself and the recent decision by Judge Alsup (*U.S. vs. Barley*).

Response

The NPS has a responsibility to protect resources under the NPS Organic Act, 16 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*, the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Act, 16 U.S.C. 460bb *et seq.* Concurrent to the Committee discussions, NPS is initiating preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to determine when and where off-leash and on-leash dogwalking can occur and under what conditions. The scope and sideboards of the Committee discussions were not affected by Judge Alsup's recent decision (*U.S. vs. Barley*), which was based on a procedural error and is in effect until such time as the procedural error is corrected or a new regulation is adopted. The NPS feels that Negotiated Rulemaking gives the best chance of success for resolving this controversial issue. The NOI states that the scope of the Negotiated Rulemaking discussions can include on-leash dogwalking, which will be included in a dog management plan for GGNRA.

Non-Substantive Comments

A number of comments were received that did not address the establishment or membership of the negotiated rulemaking committee, but did address the general issue of off-leash dogwalking. Those comments addressed the following categories: support or opposition of establishing off-leash dogwalking in GGNRA; options for establishing and managing off-leash dogwalking in GGNRA; the history of off-leash dogwalking at GGNRA; the mandate of GGNRA to protect the resources for which it was established; the existence of an NPS-wide leash regulation; that GGNRA is not responsible for providing off-leash recreation; the need for dogs to be off-leash; the impact, or lack of impact, of off-leash dogs on natural resources; the safety, or risk, that off-leash dogwalking creates; that off-leash dogwalking has restricted use of park areas by other user groups and that all taxpayers are equally entitled to use the park.

Response

The NPS will be preparing a comprehensive dog management plan and associated environmental impact statement that will evaluate a full range of reasonable alternatives for dog management at GGNRA. The NPS will take these comments into consideration when preparing the plan.

Committee Membership

The Secretary has appointed the following primary and alternate members to the Committee:

1. The interests of the Department of the Interior will be represented by: National Park Service—Christine Powell
Alternate—Howard Levitt
2. The interests of organizations and visitors advocating off-leash use will be represented by:
 - a. Crissy Field Dog Group—Martha Walters
Alternate—Cynthia Adams
 - b. Fort Funston Dog Walkers—Linda McKay
Alternate—Karin Hu
 - c. CalDog—Gary Fergus
Alternate—Carol Copey
 - d. Pacifica Dog Walkers—Jeri Flinn
Alternate—Anne Farrow
 - e. San Francisco Dog Owners Group—Keith McAllister
Alternate—Carol Arnold
3. The interests of commercial dog walking businesses will be represented by: ProDog—Joe Hague
Alternate—Donna Sproull
4. The interests of environmental organizations will be represented by:
 - a. California Native Plant Society—Mark Heath
Alternate—Jake Sigg
 - b. Center for Biological Diversity—Brent Plater
Alternate—Jeff Miller
 - c. Birdwatchers—Arthur Feinstein (Environmentalist)
Alternate—Elizabeth Murdock (Golden Gate Audubon)
 - d. Marine Mammals—Erin Brodie (Marine Mammal Center)
Alternate—Joanne Mohr (Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association)
 - e. Sierra Club (Local Chapter)—Norman LaForce
Alternate—Gorden Bennett
 - f. San Francisco League of Conservation Voters—Steven Krefting
Alternate—Michelle Jesperson
5. The interests of other park user groups will be represented by:
 - a. Coleman Advocates for Youth—David Robinson
Alternate—Marybeth Wallace
 - b. Equestrian Groups—Judy Teichman (Marinwatch)

- Alternate—Holly Prohaska (Mar Vista Stables)
- c. Seniors and Disabled—Bruce Livingston (Senior Action Network)
Alternate—Bob Planthold (Senior Action Network)
- d. Marin Humane Society—Cindy Machado
Alternate—Steve Hill
- e. San Francisco SPCA—Daniel Crain
Alternate—Christine Rosenblat
- f. Former member of GGNRA Citizens Advisory Commission—Paul Jones
Alternate—Betsey Cutler

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix, copies of the Committee's chapter will be filled with the appropriate committees of Congress and with the Library of Congress.

Certification: I hereby certify that the administrative establishment of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee for dog management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Department of the Interior by the Act of August 25, 1916, 16 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*, and other statutes relating to the administration of the National Park System.

Dated: February 6, 2006.

Gale A. Norton,

Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 06–1529 Filed 2–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–FN–M

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

36 CFR Part 1206

RIN 3095–AB45

National Historical Publications and Records Commission Grant Program

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: NARA proposes to revise the regulations relating to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) grant program to reflect changes in the operation of the NHPRC and to clarify provisions. Beginning in FY 2005, the NHPRC began publishing online grant announcements (linked to Grants.gov). This proposed rule will affect State and local government agencies; United States nonprofit organizations and institutions, including institutions of higher education; Federally acknowledged and State-recognized American Indian tribes or groups; and

United States citizens applying for NHPRC grants as individuals.

DATES: Comments are due by April 18, 2006.

ADDRESSES: NARA invites interested persons to submit comments on this proposed rule. Please include “Attn: RIN 3095–AB45” and your name and mailing address in your comments. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- E-mail: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- Fax: Submit comments by facsimile transmission to 301–837–0319.

- Mail: Send comments to Regulations Comments Desk (NPOL), Room 4100, Policy and Communications Staff, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20740–6001.

- Hand Delivery or Courier: Deliver comments to 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nancy Allard at 301–837–1477 or fax number 301–713–7270.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NHPRC grants program regulations were last updated in 2002. This proposed rule makes the following substantive changes to those regulations:

- Clarifying and expanding the scope of eligible publications projects to include electronic editions;
- Clarifying the NHPRC's partnership with the States, including specific provisions for grant awards to the states to support statewide archival- and records-related services and regrants; and

- Changing application instructions to reflect the Government's e-grant initiatives, particularly the use of Web-based grant opportunity announcements and Grants.gov as a way to prepare and submit applications.

We have also removed or revised outdated provisions and other specific details of the application process that are covered in the grant announcements.

This proposed rule is a not significant regulatory action for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 and has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act, I certify that this rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. In fiscal year 2005 the NHPRC made grants to only 88 organizations and entities as defined in the Act, from the 137 applications submitted. The dollar value of all FY 2005 grants ranged from \$2,419 to \$264,887.

List of Subjects in 36 CFR Part 1206

Archives and records, Grants, Publications.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, NARA proposes to revise part 1206 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, to read as follows:

Part 1206—NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

Subpart A—General

Sec.

- 1206.1 How are these Questions and Answers formatted?
- 1206.2 What does this part cover?
- 1206.3 What terms have you defined?
- 1206.4 What is the purpose of the Commission?
- 1206.5 Who serves on the Commission?
- 1206.6 How do you organize the grant program?
- 1206.8 How do you operate the grant program?
- 1206.10 How do you make grant opportunities known?
- 1206.11 How may an applicant apply for an NHPRC grant?
- 1206.12 What are my responsibilities once I have received a grant?

Subpart B—Publications Grants

- 1206.20 What are the scope and purpose of publications grants?
- 1206.22 What type of proposal is eligible for a publications grant?
- 1206.24 What type of proposal is ineligible for a publications grant?

Subpart C—Records Grants

- 1206.30 What is the scope and purpose of records grants?
- 1206.32 What type of proposal is eligible for a records grant?
- 1206.34 What type of proposal is ineligible for a records grant?

Subpart D—State Records Program

- 1206.40 What is a State records program?
- 1206.41 What is a state historical records advisory board and how is it constituted?
- 1206.42 What is a State Coordinator?
- 1206.43 What are the duties of the deputy state coordinator?
- 1206.44 Who is eligible for subgrants?
- 1206.45 What rules govern subgrant distribution, cost sharing, grant administration, and reporting?

Subpart E—Applying for NHPRC Grants

- 1206.50 What types of funding and cost sharing arrangements does the Commission make?
- 1206.52 Does the Commission ever place conditions on its grants?
- 1206.54 Who may apply for NHPRC grants?
- 1206.56 When are applications due?
- 1206.58 How do I apply for a grant?
- 1206.60 What must I provide as a formal grant application?
- 1206.62 Who reviews and evaluates grant proposals?
- 1206.64 What formal notification will I receive, and will it contain other information?