

*Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act*

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rule:

a. Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million.

b. Will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions.

c. Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

*Unfunded Mandates*

This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of \$100 million or more in any given year. This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation did not impose an unfunded mandate.

**List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 926**

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: March 6, 2006.

**Allen D. Klein,**

*Director, Western Region.*

[FR Doc. E6-4360 Filed 3-24-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-05-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 100**

[CGD05-06-020]

RIN 1625-AA08

**Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Nanticoke River, Sharptown, MD**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes temporary special local regulations during the “Bo Bowman Memorial—Sharptown Regatta”, a marine event to be held on the waters of the Nanticoke River near Sharptown, Maryland. These special local regulations are necessary to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the event. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic in the Nanticoke River during the event.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before April 26, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments and related material to Commander (oax), Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704-5004. The Fifth Coast Guard District maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Fifth Coast Guard District office between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dennis Sens, Project Manager, Auxiliary and Recreational Boating Safety Branch, at (757) 398-6204.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD05-06-020), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

**Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the Coast Guard at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

**Background and Purpose**

On June 17 and 18, 2006, the Carolina Virginia Racing Association will sponsor the “Bo Bowman Memorial—Sharptown Regatta”, on the waters of the Nanticoke River at Sharptown, Maryland. The event will consist of approximately 100 hydroplanes and runabouts conducting high-speed competitive races on the waters of the Nanticoke River between the Maryland S.R. 313 Highway Bridge and Nanticoke River Light 43 (LLN 24175). A fleet of spectator vessels normally gathers nearby to view the competition. Due to the need for vessel control before, during and after the event, vessel traffic will be temporarily restricted to provide for the safety of participants, spectators and transiting vessels.

**Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The Coast Guard proposes to establish temporary special local regulations on specified waters of the Nanticoke River near Sharptown, Maryland. The regulated area includes the waters of the Nanticoke River between the Maryland S.R. 313 Highway Bridge and Nanticoke River Light 43 (LLN 24175). The temporary special local regulations will be enforced from 9:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on June 17 and 18, 2006, and will restrict general navigation in the regulated area during the power boat race. Except for persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area during the enforcement period. The Patrol Commander may allow non-participating vessels to transit the regulated area between races, when it is safe to do so. This regulated area is needed to control vessel traffic before, during and after the event to enhance the safety of participants, spectators and transiting vessels.

**Regulatory Evaluation**

This proposed rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not “significant” under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. Although this

regulation will prevent traffic from transiting a portion of the Nanticoke River during the event, the effect of this regulation will not be significant due to the limited duration that the regulated area will be in effect and the extensive advance notifications that will be made to the maritime community via the Local Notice to Mariners, marine information broadcasts, and area newspapers, so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly. Additionally, the regulated area has been narrowly tailored to impose the least impact on general navigation yet provide the level of safety deemed necessary. Vessel traffic may transit the regulated area between heats, when the Coast Guard Patrol Commander deems it is safe to do so.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term “small entities” comprises 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.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of the Nanticoke River during the event.

This rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This rule would be in effect for only a limited period. Vessel traffic may transit the regulated area between heats, when the Coast Guard Patrol Commander deems it is safe to do so. Before the enforcement period, we will issue maritime advisories so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

### Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement

Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the address listed under **ADDRESSES**. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

### Collection of Information

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

### Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

### Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### Taking of Private Property

This proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed rule under Executive Order 13045,

Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

### Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

### Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

### Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

### Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National

Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, we believe that this rule should be categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine parade permit are specifically excluded from further analysis and documentation under that section.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Check List” is not required for this rule. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether to categorically exclude this rule from further environmental review.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

#### PART 100—SAFETY OF LIFE ON NAVIGABLE WATERS

1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1233; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Add temporary § 100.35–T05–020 to read as follows:

##### § 100.35–T05–020 Nanticoke River, Sharptown, MD.

(a) *Definitions.* (1) *Coast Guard Patrol Commander* means a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by the Commander, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore.

(2) *Official Patrol* means any vessel assigned or approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore with a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board and displaying a Coast Guard ensign.

(3) *Participant* includes all vessels participating in the Bo Bowman Memorial—Sharptown Regatta under the auspices of the Marine Event Permit issued to the event sponsor and approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore.

(b) *Regulated area* includes all waters of the Nanticoke River, near Sharptown, Maryland, between Maryland S.R. 313 Highway Bridge and Nanticoke River Light 43 (LLN 24175), bounded by a line

drawn between the following points: southeasterly from latitude 38°32′46″ N., longitude 075°43′14″ W.; to latitude 38°32′42″ N., longitude 075°43′09″ W.; thence northeasterly to latitude 38°33′04″ N., longitude 075°42′39″ W.; thence northwesterly to latitude 38°33′09″ N., longitude 075°42′44″ W.; thence southwesterly to latitude 38°32′46″ N., longitude 075°43′14″ W. All coordinates reference Datum NAD 1983.

(c) *Special local regulations.* (1) Except for event participants and persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

(2) The operator of any vessel in the regulated area shall:

(i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any Official Patrol.

(ii) Proceed as directed by any Official Patrol.

(iii) When authorized to transit the regulated area, all vessels shall proceed at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course that minimizes wake near the race course.

(c) *Effective period.* This section will be effective from 9:30 a.m. on June 17, to 6:30 p.m. on June 18, 2006.

(d) *Enforcement period.* It is expected that this section will be enforced from 9:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on June 17 and 18, 2006.

Dated: March 14, 2006.

**Larry L. Hereth,**

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

[FR Doc. E6–4377 Filed 3–24–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### Patent and Trademark Office

#### 37 CFR Part 2

[Docket No. PTO–T–2005–0014]

RIN 0651–AB56

#### Miscellaneous Changes to Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Rules

**AGENCY:** United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; notice of reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is reopening the comment period for proposed changes to certain rules affecting practice before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board that were published in the **Federal Register** January 17, 2006. Interested members of the public are

invited to submit written comments on these proposed changes by the new deadline for comments.

**DATES:** The comment period for the proposed rule published at 71 FR 2498, January 17, 2006, originally set to close on March 20, 2006, is reopened from March 27, 2006, until May 4, 2006 (45 days beyond the original deadline).

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be sent by e-mail to [AB56Comments@uspto.gov](mailto:AB56Comments@uspto.gov), or by mail addressed to Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, P.O. Box 1451, Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1451, marked to the attention of Gerard F. Rogers. Comments may also be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet via the Federal eRulemaking Portal. See <http://www.regulations.gov> for additional instructions on using this option.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gerard F. Rogers, Administrative Trademark Judge, Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, by telephone at (571) 272–4299, or by e-mail addressed to [Gerard.Rogers@uspto.gov](mailto:Gerard.Rogers@uspto.gov), or by facsimile transmission marked to his attention and sent to (571) 273–0059.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A notice of proposed rule making to amend certain rules governing practice before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board was published in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2006 (71 FR 2498). A number of comments made in response to that notice suggested that an extension of the comment period would be helpful; and some of these recommended a public hearing. In addition, the Trademark Public Advisory Committee has recommended to the USPTO an extension and a hearing. The USPTO has decided to reopen the comment period (announcement of an extension not being possible before the scheduled close of the comment period on March 20, 2006). The USPTO has also decided, however, that written comments are preferred over oral comments and therefore will not schedule a public hearing. Any comments submitted after the close of the original comment period on March 20, 2006, but prior to the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** will be considered. All comments submitted between January 17, 2006 and May 4, 2006, will be considered. All comments will be posted for public viewing on the Internet via the Federal eRulemaking Portal (<http://www.regulations.gov>).