

on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Under Executive Order 13132, this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications for which we would prepare a Federalism Assessment.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), reviewed this regulation. By approving it, the Director certifies that it will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities because: This rule is about the correctional management of offenders committed to the custody of the Attorney General or the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and its economic impact is limited to the Bureau's appropriated funds.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not cause State, local and Tribal governments, or the private sector, to spend \$100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. We do not need to take action under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This rule is not a major rule as defined by § 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 513

Prisoners.

Harley G. Lappin,

Director, Bureau of Prisons.

Under rulemaking authority vested in the Attorney General in 5 U.S.C 301; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510 and delegated to the Director, Bureau of Prisons in 28 CFR 0.96, we propose to amend 28 CFR part 513, subpart D, as follows.

SUBCHAPTER A—GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

PART 513—ACCESS TO RECORDS

1. Revise the authority citation for 28 CFR part 513 to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 13 U.S.C.; 18 U.S.C. 3621, 3622, 3624, 4001, 4042, 4942, 4081, 4082 (Repealed in part as to conduct occurring on or after November 1, 1987), 5006–5024 (Repealed October 12, 1984, as to conduct occurring after that date), 5039; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510; 31 U.S.C. 3711(f); 5 CFR part 297.

2. Revise § 513.40(a) as follows:

§ 513.40 Inmate access to Inmate Central File.

* * * * *

(a) *Inmate review of his/her Inmate Central File.* (1) *Request to review Inmate Central File.* An inmate may at any time request to review all disclosable portions of his/her Inmate Central File by submitting a request to a staff member designated by the Warden. Staff are to acknowledge the request and schedule the inmate, as promptly as is practical, for a review of the file at a time which will not disrupt institution operations.

(2) *Pre-Sentence Investigation Reports, Statements of Reason, or other similar documents.* Inmates incarcerated in Bureau facilities, including those in contract facilities or community confinement, are prohibited from possessing their Pre-Sentence Investigation Reports (PSRs), Statements of Reasons (SORs), or other similar sentencing documents from criminal judgments.

(i) *Sentenced inmates* in Bureau facilities, including those in contract facilities or community confinement, may request an opportunity to review these documents and take notes, but will not be permitted to possess copies of these documents.

(ii) *Pretrial inmates* in Bureau facilities, including those in contract facilities or community confinement, may possess and review these documents in preparation for sentencing.

(iii) *Persons other than the inmate* may not obtain copies of inmate PSRs, SORs, or other similar documents from the Bureau while the inmate is incarcerated in a Bureau facility, including those in contract facilities or community confinement, even if they provide written authorization from the inmate. Such persons may request these documents directly from the sentencing court, defense counsel, or U.S. Probation Office.

[FR Doc. 2010–6288 Filed 3–22–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG–2010–0129]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zones; Annual Events Requiring Safety Zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to amend the regulations establishing permanent safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone during annual events. When these safety zones are activated, and thus subject to enforcement, this rule would restrict vessels from portions of water areas during annual events that pose a hazard to public safety. The safety zones amended by this proposed rule are necessary to protect spectators, participants, and vessels from the hazards associated with fireworks displays, boat races, and other events.

DATES: Comments and related materials must be received by the Coast Guard on or before April 22, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2010–0129 using any one of the following methods:

(1) *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>.

(2) *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

(3) *Mail:* Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001.

(4) *Hand Delivery:* Same as mail address above, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or e-mail BM1 Adam Kraft, Prevention Department, Coast Guard, Sector Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI, telephone (414) 747–7154, e-mail Adam.D.Kraft@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting

material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided.

Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2010–0129), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (via <http://www.regulations.gov>) or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via <http://www.regulations.gov>, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an e-mail address, or a telephone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the “submit a comment” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Document Type” drop down menu select “Proposed Rule” and insert “USCG–2010–0129” in the “Keyword” box. Click “Search” then click on the balloon shape in the “Actions” column. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the “read comments” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Keyword” box insert “USCG–2010–0129” and click “Search.” Click the “Open Docket Folder” in the “Actions” column. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. We have an agreement with the Department of Transportation to use the Docket Management Facility.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one by using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why you believe a public meeting 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**.

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the public meeting, contact BM1 Adam Kraft at the telephone number or e-mail address indicated under the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice.

Background and Purpose

This proposed rule will amend the regulations establishing safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone during annual events. These safety zones are necessary to protect vessels and people from the hazards associated with firework displays, boat races, and other marine events. Such hazards include obstructions to the waterway that may cause marine casualties and the explosive danger of fireworks and debris falling into the water that may cause death or serious bodily harm.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed rule will revise the location of three permanent safety zones to reflect the correct enforcement area, and add two permanent safety zones for already established annually occurring events in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone. The proposed rule is necessary to ensure the safety of vessels and people during annual marine events in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan area of responsibility.

The proposed safety zones will be enforced only immediately before, during, and after events that pose hazard to the public, and only upon notice by the Captain of the Port.

The Captain of the Port Lake Michigan will notify the public that the zones in this proposal are or will be enforced by all appropriate means to the affected segments of the public including publication in the **Federal Register** as practicable, in accordance with 33 CFR 165.7(a). Such means of notification may also include, but are not limited to Broadcast Notice to Mariners or Local Notice to Mariners. The Captain of the Port will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners notifying the public when enforcement of the safety zone established by this section is cancelled.

All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or the designated representative. Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within the safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan, or their designated representative. The Captain of the Port or their designated representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

Regulatory Planning and Review

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.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary. The Coast Guard’s use of these safety zones will be periodic, of

short duration, and designed to minimize the impact on navigable waters. These safety zones will only be enforced immediately before, during, and after the time the events occur. Furthermore, these safety zones have been designed to allow vessels to transit unrestricted to portions of the waterways not affected by the safety zones. The Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse impact to mariners from the activation of these safety zones.

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 proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners and operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in the areas designated as safety zones during the dates and times the safety zones are being enforced. These safety zones would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Each safety zone in this proposed rule will be in effect for a short period of time and only once per year. These safety zones have been designed to allow traffic to pass safely around the zone whenever possible and vessels will be allowed to pass through the zones with the permission of the Captain of the Port.

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 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 BM1 Adam Kraft, Prevention Department, Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI at (414) 747–7154. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Collection of Information

This proposed 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 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 (adjusted for inflation) 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 will not affect the 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. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a “tribal implication” under the Order.

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 Department of Homeland

Security Management Directive 023-01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide 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 this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this preliminary determination is available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES. This proposed rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2-1, paragraph 34(g) of the Instruction. This proposed rule amends permanent safety zones established in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone to protect the public from the hazards associated during annual events. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Security measures, 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, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05-1, 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. Amend § 165.929 to revise (a)(15)(i), (a)(52)(i), and (a)(65)(i); and to add paragraphs (a)(82) and (a)(83) to read as follows:

§ 165.929 Safety Zones; Annual events requiring safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone.

(a) * * * (15) Taste of Chicago Fireworks; Chicago, IL. (i) Location. All waters of Monroe Harbor and all waters of Lake Michigan bounded by a line drawn from 41°53'24" N, 087°35'59" W; then east to 41°53'15" N, 087°35'26" W; then south to 41°52'49" N, 087°35'26" W; then southwest to 41°52'27" N, 087°36'37" W; then north to 41°53'15" N, 087°36'33" W; then east returning to the point of origin. (NAD 83)

* * * * *

(52) Gary Air and Water Show; Gary, IN. (i) Location. All waters of Lake Michigan bounded by a line drawn from 41°37'42" N, 087°16'38" W; then east to 41°37'54" N, 087°14'00" W; then south to 41°37'30" N, 087°13'56" W; then west to 41°37'17" N, 087°16'36" W; then north returning to the point of origin. (NAD 83)

* * * * *

(65) Venetian Night Fireworks; Chicago, IL. (i) Location. All waters of Monroe Harbor and all waters of Lake Michigan bounded by a line drawn from 41°53'03" N, 087°36'36" W; then east to 41°53'03" N, 087°36'21" W; then south to 41°52'27" N, 087°36'21" W; then west to 41°52'27" N, 087°36'37" W; then north returning to the point of origin. (NAD 83)

* * * * *

(82) Cochrane Cup; Blue Island, IL. (i) Location. All waters of the Calumet Sag Channel from the South Halstead Street Bridge at 41°39'27" N, 087°38'29" W; to the Crawford Avenue Bridge at 41°39'05" N, 087°43'08" W; and the Little Calumet River from the Ashland Avenue Bridge at 41°39'7" N, 087°39'38" W; to the junction of the Calumet Sag Channel at 41°39'23" N, 087°39' W (NAD 83).

(ii) Enforcement date and time. The first Saturday of May; 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

* * * * *

(83) World War II Beach Invasion Re-enactment; St. Joseph, MI. (i) Location. All waters of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Tiscornia Park in St. Joseph, MI beginning at 42°06.55N, 086°29.23W; then west/northwest along the north breakwater to 42°06.59 N, 086°29.41 W; the northwest 100 yards to 42°07.01 N, 086°29.44 W; then northeast 2,243 yards to 42°07.50N, 086°28.43 W; the southeast to the shoreline at 42°07.39N, 086°28.27 W; then southwest along the shoreline to the point of origin (NAD 83).

(ii) Enforcement date and time. The third Saturday of June; 8 a.m. to 2 p.m.

* * * * *

Dated: March 8, 2010. L. Barndt, Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Lake Michigan. [FR Doc. 2010-6294 Filed 3-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0172; FRL-9129-3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; PM-10; Determination of Attainment for the Coso Junction Nonattainment Area; Determination Regarding Applicability of Certain Clean Air Act Requirements

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to determine that the Coso Junction nonattainment area (CJNA) in California has attained the 24-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers (PM-10). This proposed determination is based upon monitored air quality data for the PM-10 NAAQS during the years 2006-2008. In addition, data for 2009 contained in EPA's Air Quality System (AQS) shows the CJNA continued to attain the PM-10 NAAQS through 2009, and preliminary data for 2010 available to date show no exceedances of the 24-hour NAAQS have been recorded at the CJNA monitoring site. EPA is also proposing to determine that, because the CJNA has attained the PM-10 NAAQS, the obligation to make submissions to meet certain Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act) requirements is not applicable as long as the CJNA continues to attain the PM-10 NAAQS.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before April 22, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0172, by one of the following methods:

- (1) Federal eRulemaking portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions. (2) E-mail: mahdavi.sarvy@epa.gov. (3) Mail or deliver: Sarvy Mahdavi (AIR-2), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Instructions: All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that