

Navigation Rules means the Navigation Rules, International and Inland (See, 1972 COLREGS and 33 U.S.C. 2001 *et seq.*).

Official Patrol means those persons designated by Captain of the Port Buffalo, Detroit, Sault Ste. Marie and Lake Michigan to monitor a Tall Ship safety and security zone, permit entry into the zone, give legally enforceable orders to persons or vessels within the zone and take other actions authorized by the cognizant Captain of the Port. Persons authorized in paragraph (i) to enforce this section are designated as the Official Patrol.

Public Vessel means vessels owned, chartered, or operated by the United States, or by a State or political subdivision thereof.

Tall Ship means any sailing vessel participating in the 2006 Tall Ships Challenge in the Great Lakes. The following vessels are participating in the 2006 Tall Ships Challenge: Sailing Vessel (S/V) Appledore IV, S/V Denis Sullivan, S/V Appledore V, S/V Friends Good Will, S/V Highlander Sea, S/V Niagara, S/V Madeline, S/V Nina, S/V Picton Castle, S/V Pathfinder, S/V Playfiar, S/V Providence, S/V Pride of Baltimore, S/V St. Lawrence II, S/V Red Witch, S/V Royaliste, S/V Windy, S/V Unicorn, and S/V Windy II.

(b) Safety and Security zone. The following areas are safety and security zones: all navigable waters of United States located in the Ninth Coast Guard District within a 100 yard radius of any Tall Ship sailing vessel.

(c) Effective Period. This section is effective from 12:01 a.m. (local) on Wednesday July 11th, 2006 through 12:01 a.m. (local) on August, 10th 2006.

(d) Regulations. When within a Tall Ship safety and security zone all vessels must operate at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course and must proceed as directed by the on-scene official patrol. No vessel or person is allowed within 25 yards of a Tall Ship that is underway, at anchor, or moored, unless authorized by the cognizant Captain of the Port, his designated representative, or on-scene official patrol.

(e) Navigation Rules. The Navigation Rules shall apply at all times within a Tall Ships security and safety zone.

(f) To request authorization to operate within 25 yards of a large passenger vessel that is underway or at anchor, contact the on-scene official patrol on VHF-FM channel 16.

(g) When conditions permit, the on-scene official patrol should:

(1) Permit vessels constrained by their navigational draft or restricted in their ability to maneuver to pass within 25

yards of a Tall Ship in order to ensure a safe passage in accordance with the Navigation Rules; and

(2) Permit vessels that must transit via a navigable channel or waterway to pass within 25 yards of a Tall Ship that is anchored or moored with minimal delay consistent with safety and security.

(h) When a Tall Ship approaches within 25 yards of any vessel that is moored or anchored, the stationary vessel must stay moored or anchored while it remains within the Tall Ship's safety and security zone unless it is either ordered by, or given permission by Captain of the Port Buffalo, Detroit, Sault Ste. Marie or Lake Michigan, his designated representative, or the on-scene official patrol to do otherwise.

(i) Enforcement. Any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer may enforce the rules in this section.

(j) Exemption. Public vessels as defined in paragraph (a) of this section are exempt from complying with paragraphs (b), (d), (f), (g), and (h) of this section.

(k) Waiver. Captain of the Port Buffalo, Detroit, Sault Ste. Marie and Lake Michigan, may, within their respective Captain of the Port zones, waive any of the requirements of this section for any vessel or class of vessels upon finding that a vessel or class of vessels, operational conditions or other circumstances are such that application of this section is unnecessary or impractical for the purpose of port security, safety or environmental safety.

Dated: May 23, 2006.

T.W. Sparks,

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

[FR Doc. E6-8610 Filed 6-1-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Prince William Sound 02-012]

RIN 1625-AA87

Security Zones; Port Valdez and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, AK

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to revise its regulation entitled Port Valdez and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, Alaska—security zones. This change would include more accurate position information for the boundaries of tank

vessels navigating on the Valdez Narrows Optimum Track Line, and establish when the Valdez Narrows Tanker Optimum Track line is activated and subject to enforcement.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before July 3, 2006.

ADDRESSES: 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 Marine Safety Office Valdez, 105 Clifton, Valdez, AK 99686 between 7:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Duane Lemmon, Chief, Maritime Homeland Security Department, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Valdez, Alaska, (907) 835-7262.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

The Coast Guard is taking this action to revise 33 CFR 165.1710(a)(3)(71 FR 2154, January 13, 2006) entitled Port Valdez and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, Alaska—security zones. This revision would include more accurate position information for the boundaries of tank vessels navigating on the Valdez Narrows Optimum Track Line, and establish when the Valdez Narrows Tanker Optimum Track line is activated and subject to enforcement.

On November 7, 2001, we published three temporary final rules in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 56208, 56210, 56212) that created security zones effective through June 1, 2002. The section numbers and titles for these zones are—

§ 165.T17-003—Security zone; Trans-Alaska Pipeline Valdez Terminal Complex, Valdez, Alaska,

§ 165.T17-004—Security zone; Port Valdez, and

§ 165.T17-005—Security zones; Captain of the Port Zone, Prince William Sound, Alaska.

Then on June 4, 2002, we published a temporary final rule (67 FR 38389) that established security zones to replace these security zones. That rule created temporary § 165.T17-009, entitled “Port Valdez and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, Alaska—security zone”.

Then on July 31, 2002, we published a temporary final rule (67 FR 49582) that established security zones to extend the temporary security zones that would have expired. This extension was to allow for the completion of a notice-and-comment rulemaking to create permanent security zones to replace the temporary zones.

On October 23, 2002, we published the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that sought public comment on establishing permanent security zones similar to the temporary security zones (67 FR 65074). The comment period for that NPRM ended December 23, 2002. Although no comments were received that would result in changes to the proposed rule an administrative omission was found that resulted in the need to issue a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNPRM) to address a collection of information issue regarding of the proposed rule (68 FR 14935, March 27, 2003).

Then on May 19, 2004, we published a Second Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (SSNPRM)(69 FR 28871) incorporating changes to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline (TAPS) Valdez Terminal complex (Terminal), Valdez, Alaska security zone coordinates described in the NPRM (67 FR 65074). These changes included more accurate position information for the boundaries of the security zone. The comment period for that SNPRM ended on July 30, 2004. Although no comments were received that would result in changes to the SSNPRM, we have learned over the last 3 years while enforcing the temporary security zones (see those mentioned above and 68 FR 26490 (May 16, 2003) and 68 FR 62009 (October 31, 2003)) that the TAPS Terminal security zone is actually larger than it needs to be and that a smaller zone would allow the Coast Guard to monitor and enforce the zone more effectively. To make the security zone smaller, we proposed changes to the TAPS Terminal security zone coordinates in a Third Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (TSNPRM) (70 FR 58646, October 7, 2005). In that TSNPRM, we also proposed removing unnecessary text from the description of the Valdez Narrows, Port Valdez, Valdez, Alaska security zone in proposed 33 CFR 165.1710(a)(3). We received no comments on the proposed rule published October 7, 2005.

On January, 13, 2006, we published a final rule in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 2152) that established permanent security zones encompassing the Trans-Alaska Pipeline (TAPS) Valdez Terminal Complex, Valdez, Alaska, and TAPS tank vessels and the Valdez Narrows, Port Valdez, Alaska. These security zones are necessary to protect the TAPS Terminal and vessels from damage or injury from sabotage, destruction or other subversive acts. This rule was effective February 13, 2006.

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 proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

Economic impact is expected to be minimal because there are alternative routes for vessels to use when the zone is enforced, permits to enter the zone are available, and the Tank Vessel Moving Security Zone is in effect for a short duration.

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. The number of small entities impacted by this proposed rule is expected to be minimal because there are alternative routes for vessels to use when the zone is enforced, permission to enter the zone is available, and the Tank Vessel Moving Security Zone is in effect for a short duration. Since the time frame this proposed rule is in effect may cover commercial harvests of fish in the area, the entities most likely affected are commercial and native subsistence fishermen. The Captain of the Port will consider applications for entry into the security zone on a case-by-case basis; therefore, it is likely that very few, if any, small entities will be impacted by this proposed rule. Those interested may apply for a permit to enter the zone by contacting Marine Safety Office, Valdez at the above contact number.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental

jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed 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 proposed rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 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 proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact LTJG Duane Lemmon, Marine Safety Office Valdez, Alaska at (907) 835–7218.

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 proposed 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 proposed 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 concluded 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, this proposed rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. This proposed rule creates no additional vessel traffic and thus imposes no additional burdens on the environment in Prince William Sound. It simply regulates vessels transiting in the Captain of the Port, Prince William Sound Zone for security purposes so that they may transit safely in the vicinity of the Port of Valdez and the TAPS Terminal. A draft "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a draft "Categorical Exclusion Determination" (CED) are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Safety measures, Vessels, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 165.1710(a)(3) to read as follows:

§ 165.1710 Port Valdez and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, Alaska—security zones.

(a) * * *

(3) *Valdez Narrows, Port Valdez, Valdez, Alaska.* All waters within 200 yards of the Valdez Narrows Tanker Optimum Track line, when a tank vessel is navigating through the narrows.

(i) The Valdez Narrows Optimum Track line is a line commencing at

61°05.38' N, 146°37.38' W; thence south westerly to 61°04.05' N, 146°40.05' W; thence southerly to 61°03.00' N, 146°41.20' W.

(ii) This security zone encompasses all waters 200 yards either side of the Valdez Narrows Optimum Track line.

(iii) Whenever a tank vessel is navigating on the Valdez Narrows Optimum Track line, the security zone is activated and subject to enforcement. All vessels forward of a tank vessel's movement must vacate the security zone surrounding the Optimum Track line. Vessels may reenter the security zone astern of a moving vessel provided that a 200 yards separation is given, as required in paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

* * * * *

Dated: May 8, 2006.

M.S. Gardiner,

Commander, United States Coast Guard, Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Prince William Sound, Alaska.

[FR Doc. E6–8544 Filed 6–1–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CCGD05–06–054]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone: Fireworks on the Bay Celebration, Chesapeake Bay, Virginia Beach, VA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing the establishment of a 500-foot safety zone on the Chesapeake Bay in support of the Fireworks on the Bay Celebration. This event is will be held at First Landing State Park, Virginia Beach, VA on July 04, 2006, and if warranted due to inclement weather, July 5, 2006. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic on Chesapeake Bay as necessary to protect mariners from the hazards associated with fireworks displays.

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

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander, Sector Hampton Roads, Norfolk Federal Building, 200 Granby St., 7th Floor, Attn: Lieutenant Bill Clark, Norfolk, VA 23510. Sector Hampton Roads maintains the public docket for this rulemaking.