

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165****[CGD05-06-027]****RIN 1625-AA00****Safety Zone: Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Norfolk, VA****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes the establishment of a safety zone in support of the Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks Display occurring on June 30, 2006 on the Chesapeake Bay, Norfolk, VA. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic on the 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 1, 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. 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 will be available for inspection or copying at the Norfolk Federal Building between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Bill Clark, Chief, Waterways Management Division, Sector Hampton Roads at (757) 668-5580.

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 CGD05-06-027 and 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 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 Commander, Sector Hampton Roads 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

On June 30, 2006, the Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks Display will be held on the Chesapeake Bay, Norfolk, VA. Spectators will be observing from both the shore and from vessels. Due to the need to protect mariners and spectators from the hazards associated with the fireworks display, vessel traffic will be temporarily restricted within a 400 foot radius of the display.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a safety zone that encompasses all waters within 400 feet of position 36-57-21N/076-15-00W on the Chesapeake Bay in the vicinity of Ocean View Beach Park in support of the Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks Display. The safety zone will be enforced from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m. on June 30, 2006. General navigation in the safety zone will be restricted during the event. Except for participants and vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

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. Although this regulation restricts access to the

regulated area, the effect of this rule will not be significant because: (i) The safety zone will be in effect for a limited duration of time and (ii) the Coast Guard will make notifications via maritime advisories so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

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 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 and operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in that portion of the Chesapeake Bay from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m. on June 30, 2006. The safety zone will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities, because the zone will only be in place for a limited duration of time and maritime advisories will be issued, so the mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

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 (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 Lieutenant Bill Clark, Chief, Waterways Management Division, Sector Hampton Roads at (757) 668-5580.

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 would not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this 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 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 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)(h), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Under

figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Check List” is not required for this rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 subpart C 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.T06–027, to read as follows:

§ 165.T06–027 Safety Zone: Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Norfolk, VA.

(a) Location. The following area is a safety zone: All waters of the Chesapeake Bay within 400 feet of position 36–57–21N / 076–15–00W in the Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads zone as defined in 33 CFR 3.25–10 in the vicinity of Ocean View Beach Park in support of the Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks Display in Norfolk, VA.

(b) Definition:

Captain of the Port Representative: means any U.S. Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been authorized by the Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads to act on his behalf.

(c) Regulation:

(1) In accordance with the general regulations in 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads or his designated representatives.

(2) The operator of any vessel in the immediate vicinity of this safety zone shall:

(i) Stop the vessel immediately upon being directed to do so by any commissioned, warrant or petty officer on shore or on board a vessel displaying a U.S. Coast Guard Ensign.

(ii) Proceed as directed by any commissioned, warrant or petty officer on shore or on board a vessel displaying a U.S. Coast Guard Ensign.

(1) The Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads and the Sector Duty Officer at Sector Hampton Roads in Portsmouth, Virginia can be contacted at telephone

Number (757) 668-5555 or (757) 484-8192.

(2) The Coast Guard Representatives enforcing the safety zone can be contacted on VHF-FM 13 and 16.

(d) Effective date: This regulation is effective from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m. on June 30, 2006.

Dated: April 4, 2006.

Robert R. O'Brien, Jr.,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads.

[FR Doc. E6-5584 Filed 4-13-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2006-0287; FRL-8158-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission by the state of Missouri which revises the Construction Permits Required rule, and we are taking no action on the revisions made to the Emissions Banking and Trading rule. We propose to approve most of the revisions to the Construction Permits Required rule because the revisions incorporate, by reference, the Federal New Source Review reforms, published in the **Federal Register** on December 31, 2002. In a February 28, 2006, letter from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Missouri requested EPA not act on certain rule references. Specifically, Missouri requested EPA not act on references to Clean Unit Exemptions, Pollution Control Projects, and the record keeping provisions for the actual-to-projected-actual emissions projections. Missouri requests no action on these provisions because of the June 24, 2005, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit's decision, which vacated the Clean Unit Exemption and Pollution Control Project provisions and remanded back to EPA the recordkeeping provisions for the actual-to-projected-actual emissions projections standard for when a source must keep certain project related records.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 15, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-

OAR-2006-0287, by one of the following methods:

1. <http://www.regulations.gov>: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. E-mail: algoe-eakin.amy@epa.gov.

3. Mail: Amy Algae-Eakin, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

4. Hand Delivery or Courier. Deliver your comments to: Amy Algae-Eakin, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2006-0287. EPA's policy is that all comments received 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 information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. The <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through <http://www.regulations.gov>, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket. All documents in the electronic docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either

electronically in <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas. EPA requests that you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the office at least 24 hours in advance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy Algae-Eakin at (913) 551-7942, or by e-mail at algoe-eakin.amy@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document whenever "we," "us," or "our" is used, we mean EPA. This section provides additional information by addressing the following questions:

What Is the Federal Approval Process for a SIP?

What Is Being Addressed in This Document?

What Is the Background for EPA's New Source Review (NSR) Reform Rule?

What Is Missouri's NSR Reform Rule and What Action Has Missouri Requested on the Rule?

What Is EPA's Proposed Action on Missouri's Definition of "Baseline Area"?

Have the Requirements for Approval of a SIP Revision Been Met?

What Action Is EPA Proposing?

What Is the Federal Approval Process for a SIP?

In order for state regulations to be incorporated into the Federally-enforceable SIP, states must formally adopt the regulations and control strategies consistent with state and Federal requirements. This process generally includes a public notice, public hearing, public comment period, and a formal adoption by a state-authorized rulemaking body.

Once a state rule, regulation, or control strategy is adopted, the state submits it to us for inclusion into the SIP. We must provide public notice and seek additional public comment regarding the proposed Federal action on the state submission. If adverse comments are received, they must be addressed prior to any final Federal action by us.

All state regulations and supporting information approved by EPA under section 110 of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) are incorporated into the Federally-approved SIP. Records of such SIP actions are maintained in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at title 40, part 52, entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans." The actual state regulations which are approved are not reproduced in their