

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 rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Check List” and a “Categorical Exclusion Determination” are 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 a temporary § 100.35–T05–024 to read as follows:

§ 100.35–T05–024 Rappahannock River, Essex County, Westmoreland County, Layton, Virginia.

(a) Regulated area. The regulated area is established for the waters of the Rappahannock River, adjacent to Layton, VA, from shoreline to shoreline, bounded on the west by a line running along longitude 076°58’30” W, and bounded on the east by a line running along longitude 076°56’00” W. All coordinates reference Datum NAD 1983.

(b) 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 Hampton Roads.

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

(c) *Regulations:* (1) Except for 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 and then proceed only as directed.

(ii) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the 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.

(d) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 11:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on June 3 and 4, 2006; and 11:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on October 7 and 8, 2006.

Dated: March 23, 2006.

Larry L. Hereth,

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

[FR Doc. E6–4788 Filed 3–31–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07–06–011]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Little River (S–20) Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Mile 347.3, Horry County, SC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the request to open regulation of the Little River (S–20) Bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 347.3 in Horry County, South Carolina. This proposed rule will allow the swingbridge to open as necessary on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour and forty minutes past the hour from 6 a.m. through 6 p.m., Monday through Friday except Federal holidays. At all other times, the bridge will open upon demand. This proposed action should improve the movement of vehicular traffic while not unreasonably interfering with the movement of vessel traffic.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before June 2, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (dpb), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE. 1st Avenue, Room 432, Miami, FL 33131, who 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 are available for inspection or copying at the Seventh Coast Guard District Bridge Branch, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Project Officer, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at (305) 415–6743.

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 [CGD07–06–011], 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 8 × 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 Bridge Branch 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

The existing regulations of the Little River (S–20) Bridge, mile 347.3, at Horry County, published in 33 CFR 117.5 require the span to open on signal.

On December 20, 2005, the officials of South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) requested that the Coast Guard review the existing regulation governing the request to open operation of the Little River Bridge due to increased vehicular traffic on the bridge. The SCDOT provided traffic count and bridge opening information of a typical summer week and a typical winter week along with the most current 12 month period bridge opening data. The data collected showed an increase in vehicular traffic along the bridge during 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. This proposed rule should improve the movement of vehicular traffic from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, while not unreasonably interfering with the movement of vessel traffic.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed rule will allow as necessary the Little River (S–20) bridge, mile 347.3, at Horry County to open on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour and forty minutes past the hour, from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. At all other times, the bridge will open upon demand. This schedule will allow the local vehicular traffic the ability to plan for crossing the bridge while providing for the reasonable needs of navigation.

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. This proposed rule would modify the existing bridge schedule and should allow for improved vehicle traffic flow and provide scheduled openings for vessel traffic.

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 business, 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 may be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels needing to transit the Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Little River Bridge, persons intending to drive over the bridge and nearby business owners. Vehicle traffic and small business owners in the area might benefit from the increased traffic flow that regularly scheduled openings will offer this area.

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 proposed 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 person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. 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 will 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 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 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 M16475.1D, 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 (32)(e) of

the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction, an "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are not required for this proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. In § 117.911, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 117.911 Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Little River to Savannah River.

* * * * *

(b) Little River Bridge Intracoastal Waterway mile 347.3, Horry County, S.C. The draw of the Little River (S–20) bridge, mile 347.3 at Horry County will open as necessary on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour, and forty minutes past the hour, from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. At all other times, the bridge will open upon demand.

* * * * *

Dated: March 15, 2006.

D. B. Peterman,

*RADM, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,
Seventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. E6–4787 Filed 3–31–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07–06–041]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; 63rd Street Bridge, Indian Creek, Miami, Miami-Dade County, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the operating regulation of the 63rd Street Bridge

across Indian Creek, mile 4.0 in Miami-Dade County, Florida. This proposed rule will allow the bridge to remain closed during certain periods. This proposed temporary regulation is needed while the bridge undergoes rehabilitation. It will require the bridge to open on a regulated schedule during the rehabilitation project.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before May 15, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (dpb), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE 1st Avenue, Room 432, Miami, FL, 33131, who 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 are available for inspection or copying at the Seventh Coast Guard District Bridge Branch, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Michael Lieberum, Project Officer, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at (305) 415–6744.

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 [CGD07–06–041], 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 if 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 temporary 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 Bridge Branch 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**.