■ 2. Section 555.141 is amended by adding new paragraph (a)(10) to read as follows:

§555.141 Exemptions.

(a) * * *

(10) Model rocket motors that meet all of the following criteria—

(i) Consist of ammonium perchlorate composite propellant, black powder, or other similar low explosives;

(ii) Contain no more than 62.5 grams of total propellant weight; and

(iii) Are designed as single-use motors or as reload kits capable of reloading no more than 62.5 grams of propellant into a reusable motor casing.

Dated: August 7, 2006.

Paul J. McNulty,

Acting Attorney General.

[FR Doc. 06–6862 Filed 8–10–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD01-06-102]

RIN 1625-AA00

Safety Zone; R. Ozzie Wedding Fireworks Display, Manchester By The Sea, MA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS. **ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for the R. Ozzie Wedding Fireworks display on August 12, 2006 in Manchester By The Sea, MA, temporarily closing all waters in the vicinity of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor within a four hundred (400) yard radius of the fireworks barge located at approximate position 42°50.00' N, 070°47.00' W. This zone is necessary to protect the maritime public from the potential hazards posed by a fireworks display. The safety zone temporarily prohibits entry into or movement within this portion of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during its closure period, unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Boston, MA.

DATES: This rule is effective from 9 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006 until 10:15 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006. **ADDRESSES:** Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket CGD01–06– 102 and are available for inspection or copying at Sector Boston, 427 Commercial Street, Boston, MA, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chief Petty Officer Paul English, Sector Boston, Waterways Management Division, at (617) 223–5456.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM because the logistics with respect to the fireworks presentation were not presented to the Coast Guard with sufficient time to draft and publish an NPRM. Any delay encountered in this regulation's effective date would be contrary to the public interest since the safety zone is needed to prevent traffic from transiting a portion of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during the fireworks display and to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters.

For the same reasons, the Coast Guard finds, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The zone should have a minimal negative impact on vessel transits in Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor because vessels will be excluded from the area for only one and one quarter hours, and vessels can still safely operate in other areas of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during the event.

Background and Purpose

The Ozzie Family is holding a fireworks display to celebrate a wedding. This rule establishes a temporary safety zone on the waters in the vicinity of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor within a four hundred (400) yard radius of the fireworks barge located at approximate position 42°50.00' N, 070°47.00' W. This safety zone is necessary to protect the life and property of the maritime public from the potential dangers posed by this event. It will protect the public by prohibiting entry into or movement within the proscribed portion of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during the fireworks display.

Marine traffic may transit safely outside of the zone during the effective period. The Captain of the Port does not anticipate any negative impact on vessel traffic due to this event. Public notifications will be made prior to and during the effective period via marine information broadcasts and Local Notice to Mariners.

Discussion of Rule

This rule is effective from 9 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006 until 10:15 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006. Marine traffic may transit safely outside of the safety zone in the majority of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during the event. Given the limited time-frame of the effective period of the zone, and the actual size of the zone relative to the amount of navigable water around it, the Captain of the Port anticipates minimal negative impact on vessel traffic due to this event. Public notifications will be made prior to and during the effective period via Local Notice to Mariners and marine information broadcasts.

Regulatory Evaluation

This 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.

We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory evaluation is unnecessary. Although this rule will prevent traffic from transiting a portion of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during this event, the effect of this rule will not be significant for several reasons: Vessels will be excluded from the area of the safety zone for only one and one quarter hours; although vessels will not be able to transit the area in the vicinity of the zone, they will be able to safely operate in other areas of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor during the effective period; and advance notifications will be made to the local maritime community by marine information broadcasts and Local Notice to Mariners

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor from 9 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006 until 10:15 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006. This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the reason described under the Regulatory Evaluation section.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under subsection 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 rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. If this rule will affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please call Chief Petty Officer Paul English, Sector Boston, Waterways Management Division, at (617) 223–5456.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1– 888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

Collection of Information

This rule calls 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 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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

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

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 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 rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.lD and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 5100.1, which guide 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 rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. This rule is categorically excluded under paragraph (34)(g), because the rule establishes a safety zone. A final "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a final "Categorical Exclusion Determination" will be 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, Security measures, Waterways.

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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. Add temporary § 165.T01–102 to read as follows:

§ 165.T01–102 Safety Zone; R. Ozzie Wedding Fireworks Display, Manchester By The Sea, MA.

(a) *Location*. The following area is a safety zone:

All waters in the vicinity of Manchester Bay and Manchester Harbor, from surface to bottom, within a four hundred (400) yard radius of the fireworks barge located at approximate position 42°50.00' N, 070°47.00' W.

(b) *Effective Date.* This rule is effective from 9 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006 until 10:15 p.m. EDT on August 12, 2006.

(c) *Definitions*. (1) *Designated representative* means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port (COTP).

(2) [Reserved]

(d) *Regulations*. (1) In accordance with the general regulations in 165.23 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone by any person or vessel is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP), Boston or the COTP's designated representative.

(2) The safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(3) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone must contact the COTP or the COTP's designated representative to obtain permission to do so. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

Dated: August 1, 2006.

James L. McDonald,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Boston, Massachusetts. [FR Doc. E6–13200 Filed 8–10–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 59

RIN 2900-AM42

Priority for Partial Grants to States for Construction or Acquisition of State Home Facilities

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs. **ACTION:** Interim final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) regulations regarding grants to States for construction or acquisition of State homes. This amendment is necessary to ensure that projects designed to remedy conditions at an existing State home that have been cited as threatening to the lives or safety of the residents receive priority for receiving VA grants in the future (including in fiscal year 2007).

DATES: *Effective Date:* This interim final rule is effective August 11, 2006. Comments must be received on or before October 10, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted by: mail or hand-delivery to **Director**, Regulations Management (00REG1), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Ave., NW., Room 1068, Washington, DC 20042; fax to (202) 273-9026; or e-mail through http://www.Regulations.gov. Comments should indicate that they are submitted in response to "RIN 2900-AM42." All comments received will be available for public inspection in the Office of Regulations Management, Room 1063B, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday (except holidays). Please call (202) 273–9515 for an appointment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Frank Salvas, Chief, State Home Construction Grant Program (114), Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20420, 202–273–8534.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Congress has authorized VA to provide grants to States for the construction and acquisition of State homes for the care of veterans. See 38 U.S.C. 8131-8137. The law mandates that VA use certain priorities in establishing a list of approved projects to receive funding. VA has used these priorities to establish the priority and subpriority groups that are set forth in 38 CFR 59.50. For instance, the top priority group is for projects from States that have made sufficient funds available for their projects. That group is divided into six sub-groups, which are (in order of priority): (1) Projects to remedy conditions found to threaten the lives or safety of patients (i.e., life safety projects that may include, for example, seismic concerns, egress, smoke barriers and fire walls, fire alarm and detection, or asbestos and other hazardous materials), (2) projects from States that have not previously applied for the construction or acquisition of a State nursing home, (3) projects from States that have a great need for new State home beds, (4) other projects for the renovation of a State home, (5) projects from States that have a significant need for new State home beds, and (6) projects from States that have a limited need for new State home beds.

Sometimes, States with higherranking applications within the top

priority group deplete the available funding to the extent that VA is able to offer the State with the lowest-ranking application (for which grant funds are available) only a partial grant. Currently, 38 CFR 59.50(b) provides that if a State accepts a partial grant in a given fiscal year, that State's project will have the highest priority for funding in the next fiscal year. This provision was promulgated originally because States were hesitant to accept a partial grant if there was uncertainty of receiving sufficient grant funding in the next fiscal year. The existing regulation encourages States to accept a partial grant by giving them the highest priority for appropriated grant funds in the subsequent fiscal year. Without receiving the highest priority for appropriated grant funds, States offered a partial grant would likely turn it down, and the money would go to lower-priority projects.

VA foresees that the regulatory provision granting the highest priority for appropriated funds in the subsequent fiscal year to States accepting partial grants may render VA unable to meet its statutory obligations for prioritizing grant applications, especially for giving top priority to life safety projects. A revision is needed immediately due to the pendency of one large construction project from a State with "great" need which is in line to receive a partial grant this year and which would otherwise then consume all the funding expected for grants during fiscal year (FY) 2007. This would result in no available funds for grants for life safety projects during FY 2007, contrary to the statutory priority that is to be given those projects.

This rule changes the priority that a project receiving a partial grant may receive during the next fiscal year. Rather than receiving highest priority in the next fiscal year, a project receiving a partial grant would receive highest priority only with respect to 30 percent of the funds actually appropriated for grants. In other words, such a project would qualify to receive no more than 30 percent of the funds appropriated for this purpose. The partial-grant project could receive more funding but would have to compete for it without the advantage of any special priority. For example, a State seeking a grant for \$160 million that has received a partial grant of \$70 million in the 2006 fiscal year would qualify to receive up to 30 percent of the funds available to VA for the award of State home grants during FY 2007. If VA has \$85 million available for State home grants for FY 2007, the partial-grant State would receive 30 percent of that amount (\$25.5 million)