

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)(f), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. This rule fits the category selected from paragraph (34)(f) as it would establish a special anchorage area.

A preliminary “Environmental Analysis Check List” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether the rule should be categorically excluded from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 110 as follows:

PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471; 1221 through 1236, 2030, 2035 and 2071; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. In § 110.60 add new paragraph (p–3) to read as follows:

§ 110.60 Port of New York and vicinity.

* * * * *

(p) * * *

(p–3) Hudson River, at Village of Haverstraw. That portion of the Hudson River bound by the following points: 41°11′25.2″ N, 073°57′19.9″ W; thence to 41°11′34.2″ N, 073°57′00.8″ W; thence to 41°11′41.9″ N, 073°57′07.5″ W; thence to 41°11′31.8″ N, 073°57′26.5″ W; thence to 41°11′30.8″ N, 073°57′24.9″ W; thence to the point of origin (NAD 1983).

* * * * *

Dated: December 7, 2005.

David P. Pekoske,

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

[FR Doc. E6–583 Filed 1–18–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09–06–140]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Vermilion River, Vermilion, OH. VYC Fleet Parade.

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes establishing a temporary safety zone for the VYC Fleet Parade on the Vermilion River between the mouth of the river and the Conrail Railroad Bridge, to extend the entire width of the river. This safety zone is needed to protect persons and vessels from the potential safety hazards associated with the Fleet Parade. Entry into this zone is prohibited to all vessels unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Buffalo or a designated representative.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before February 21, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket CGD09–06–140 are part of this docket are available for inspection or copying at MSU Cleveland, 1055 East 9th Street, Cleveland, OH 44114 between 8 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant (LT) Nicole Starr, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Unit Cleveland, at (216) 937–0128.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking, 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 that your submission 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 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

This safety zone is necessary to manage vessel traffic in order to provide for the safety of life and property on navigable waters during the event. The combination of parade vessels, narrow navigational area, and large number of inexperienced recreational boaters that transit this area could easily result in serious injuries or fatalities.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes establishing a temporary safety zone for the VYC Fleet Parade on the Vermilion River between the mouth of the river (41°25′42″ N and 081°21′54″ W) and the Conrail Railroad Bridge (Mile 0.19), to extend the entire width of the river on May 29, 2006 from 2 p.m. (local) through 3 p.m. (local). These coordinates are based upon North American Datum 1983 (NAD 83).

The Coast Guard will notify the public in advance by way of Ninth Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners, Marine Information Broadcasts, and for those who request it from Marine Safety Unit Cleveland, by facsimile.

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 this rule 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 paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

This determination is based on the size and location of the safety zone within the water. Commercial vessels will not be hindered by the safety zone, as all commercial traffic will be diverted through the Lake Approach Channel. Recreational vessels will not be allowed to transit through the designated safety zone during the specified times.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule would have a significant 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 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 commercial vessels intending to transit a portion of the activated safety zone.

This safety zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: The proposed zone is only in effect for one hour on the day of the event. Before the activation of the safety zone, the Coast Guard will issue maritime advisories available to users who may be impacted through notification in the **Federal Register**, the Ninth District Coast Guard Local Notice to Mariners, Marine Information Broadcasts and when requested by facsimile.

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 (Public Law 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects and participate in the rulemaking process. 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 Lieutenant Nicole Starr, U.S. Coast Guard Marine

Safety Unit Cleveland, 1055 East 9th Street, Cleveland, OH 44114. 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 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 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 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 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 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

The Coast Guard has 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 concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may 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 government, even if that impact may not constitute a “tribal implication” under that Order.

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 procedure; and related management system practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This rule proposed 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)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. This event establishes a safety zone therefore paragraph (34)(g) of the Instruction applies.

A preliminary “Environmental Analysis Check List” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether the rule should be categorically excluded from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, 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 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. A new temporary § 165.T09–140 is added to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–140 Safety Zone; 2006 Vermilion River, Mouth of the river to Mile 0.79, Vermilion, Ohio. VYC Fleet Parade.

(a) Location. The Coast Guard proposes establishing a temporary safety zone for the VYC Fleet Parade on the Vermilion River between the mouth of the river (41°25'42" N and 081°21'54" W) and the Conrail Railroad Bridge (Mile 0.19), to extend the entire width of the river. These coordinates are based upon North American Datum 1983 (NAD 83).

(b) Effective Period. This section is effective from 2 p.m. (local) through 3 p.m. (local) on May 29, 2006.

(c) Regulations. Entry into, transit through or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative. The designated on-scene representative will be the Coast Guard Patrol Commander. The Coast Guard Patrol Commander may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

Dated: January 9, 2006.

S.J. Ferguson,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Buffalo.

[FR Doc. E6–584 Filed 1–18–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R06–OAR–2005–TX–0014; FRL–8022–3]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Control Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions; VOC Control for Facilities in the Dallas/Fort Worth (DFW) Ozone Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve Texas State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions. The revisions pertain to regulations to control VOC emissions from VOC transfer operations and solvent using processes. The revisions allow use of gasoline vapor recovery systems approved by Texas, and add new requirements to control VOC emissions from motor vehicle fuel dispensing facilities and surface coating facilities in Ellis, Johnson, Kaufman, Parker, and Rockwall Counties. These counties are part of the DFW 8-hour ozone standard nonattainment area. The revisions also amend regulations on use of cleaning solvents. We are proposing to approve the revisions pursuant to sections 110, 116 and part D of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA). The control of VOC emissions will help to attain and maintain the 8-hour national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for ozone in Texas. Approval will make the revised regulations Federally enforceable.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before February 21, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Mr. Thomas Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carl Young, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone 214–665–6645; fax number 214–665–7263; e-mail address young.carl@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State’s SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no relevant adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of the rule, and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: January 6, 2006.

Lawrence E. Starfield,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 06–434 Filed 1–18–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 20

[WT Docket No. 05–265; DA 05–3183]

Reexamination of Roaming Obligations of Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of reply comment period.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau extends the period for reply comment on the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM)* in this proceeding. The deadline to file reply comments is extended from December 27, 2005 to January 26, 2006. The action is taken to respond to a joint request filed on behalf of a number of carriers and trade associations, representing a cross-section of the wireless industry, to extend the reply comment deadline by 30 days.