

Terminating Replacement

(j) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD: Replace all identified suspect actuators with new or serviceable actuators having a new P/N listed in Table 2 "Retrofit Part Number Replacement Table" of the applicable customer bulletin. This replacement terminates the requirements of this AD, except as required by paragraph (l) of this AD.

Reporting Requirement

(k) Submit a report of any broken damper shafts to the Manager, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, One Crown Center, 1895 Phoenix Boulevard, suite 450, Atlanta, Georgia 30349; fax (770) 703-6097. The report must be done at the applicable time specified in paragraph (k)(1) or (k)(2) of this AD. The report must include the inspection date, the airplane model and S/N, the actuator position (left or right aileron or elevator), and the actuator P/N and S/N. Information collection requirements contained in this AD have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

(1) If the inspection required by paragraph (i) of this AD is done after the effective date of this AD: Submit a report within 30 days after the inspection is done.

(2) If an inspection required by paragraph (i) of this AD was done before the effective date of this AD: Submit a report within 30 days after the effective date of this AD.

Parts Installation

(l) As of the effective date of this AD, no person may install an aileron or elevator actuator having a P/N and S/N specified in the applicable customer bulletin on any airplane, unless the actuator has been inspected according to paragraph (i) of this AD.

Special Flight Permit Prohibited

(m) Special flight permits (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) are not allowed if any broken damper shaft is found during any inspection required by paragraph (i) of this AD.

Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(n)(1) The Manager, Atlanta ACO, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested in accordance with the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(2) Before using any AMOC approved in accordance with § 39.19 on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify the appropriate principal inspector in the FAA Flight Standards Certificate Holding District Office.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on March 17, 2006.

Ali Bahrami,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E6-4621 Filed 3-29-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165**

[CGD05-06-019]

RIN 1625-AA00

Safety Zone: Fireworks Display, Broad Bay, Virginia Beach, VA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes the establishment of a 420 foot safety zone in support of the Cavalier 4th of July Fireworks Display occurring on July 04, 2006, on the banks of Broad Bay, Virginia Beach, VA. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic on Broad 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 May 15, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander, Sector Hampton Roads, Federal Building, 200 Granby St., 7th Floor, Attn: Lieutenant 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 Federal Building Fifth Coast Guard District 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 CGD05-06-019 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 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 July 4, 2006, the Cavalier 4th of July Fireworks Display will be held on the banks of Broad Bay in Virginia Beach, VA. Due to the need to protect mariners and spectators from the hazards associated with the fireworks display, vessel traffic will be temporarily restricted.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a 420 foot safety zone on specified waters of Broad Bay in the vicinity of the Cavalier Golf and Yacht Club in Virginia Beach, VA. This regulated area will be established in the interest of public safety during the Cavalier 4th of July Fireworks Display and will be enforced from 9 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. on July 4, 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 COTP may authorize access to the safety zone; (ii) the safety zone will be in effect for a limited duration; and (iii) 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 because the zone will only be in place for a limited duration and maritime advisories will be issued allowing the mariners to adjust their plans accordingly. However, this rule may 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 Broad Bay from 9 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. on July 4, 2006.

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 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.T06–019, to read as follows:

§ 165.T06–019 Safety Zone: Broad Bay, Virginia Beach, VA.

(a) Location: The following area is a safety zone: All waters within 420 feet of the fireworks display at Cavalier Golf and Yacht Club on Broad Bay, Virginia beach, VA in the Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads zone as defined in 33 CFR § 3.25–10.

(b) Definition: Captain of the Port: means any U.S. Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been authorized by the Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads, Virginia 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, VA, 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 that is 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 that is displaying a U.S. Coast Guard Ensign.

(3) The Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads and the Sector Duty Officer at Sector Hampton Roads, Portsmouth, Virginia can be contacted at telephone Number (757) 668–5555 or (757) 484–8192.

(4) 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 10:30 p.m. on July 4, 2006.

Dated: March 10, 2006.

John S. Kenyon,

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

[FR Doc. E6–4610 Filed 3–29–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

37 CFR Parts 1 and 41

[Docket No.: PTO–P–2005–0016]

RIN 0651–AB77

Revisions and Technical Corrections Affecting Requirements for *Ex Parte* and *Inter Partes* Reexamination

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rule making.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) is proposing changes to the rules of practice relating to *ex parte* and *inter partes* reexamination. The Office is proposing to provide for a patent owner reply to a request for an *ex parte* reexamination or an *inter partes* reexamination prior to the examiner's decision on the request. The Office is also proposing to prohibit supplemental patent owner responses to an Office action in an *inter partes* reexamination without a showing of sufficient cause. The Office additionally proposes to designate the correspondence address for the patent as the correct address for all communications for patent owners in an *ex parte* reexamination or an *inter partes* reexamination, and to simplify the filing of reexamination papers by providing for the use of a single "mail stop" address for the filing of substantially all *ex parte* reexamination papers (such is already the case for *inter partes* reexamination papers). The Office is further proposing to make miscellaneous clarifying changes as to terminology and applicability of the reexamination rules.

Comment Deadline Date: To be ensured of consideration, written comments must be received on or before May 30, 2006. No public hearing will be held.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent by electronic mail over the Internet addressed to:

AB77.comments@uspto.gov. Comments may also be submitted by mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450; or by facsimile to (571) 273–7710, marked to the attention of Kenneth M. Schor, Senior Legal Advisor. Although comments may be submitted by mail or facsimile, the Office prefers to receive comments via the Internet. If comments are submitted by mail, the Office prefers that the comments be submitted on a

DOS formatted 3½ inch disk accompanied by a paper copy.

Comments may also be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet via the Federal eRulemaking Portal. See the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site (<http://www.regulations.gov>) for additional instructions on providing comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal.

The comments will be available for public inspection at the Office of Patent Legal Administration, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, currently located at Room MDW 07D74 of Madison West, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450, and will be available through anonymous file transfer protocol (ftp) via the Internet (address: <http://www.uspto.gov>). Since comments will be made available for public inspection, information that is not desired to be made public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By telephone—Kenneth M. Schor, at (571) 272–7710 or Robert J. Spar at (571) 272–7700; by mail addressed to U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450, marked to the attention of Kenneth M. Schor; by facsimile transmission to (571) 273–7710 marked to the attention of Kenneth M. Schor; or by electronic mail message over the Internet addressed to kenneth.schor@uspto.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office is proposing changes to the rules of practice relating to *ex parte* and *inter partes* as follows:

Proposal I: To provide for a patent owner reply to a request for an *ex parte* reexamination or an *inter partes* reexamination prior to the examiner's decision on the request.

Proposal II: To prohibit supplemental patent owner responses to an Office action in an *inter partes* reexamination without a showing of sufficient cause.

Proposal III: To designate the correspondence address for the patent as the correct address for all notices, official letters, and other communications for patent owners in an *ex parte* reexamination or an *inter partes* reexamination. Also, to simplify the filing of reexamination papers by providing for the use of "Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam" for the filing of all *ex parte* reexamination papers (not just *ex parte* reexamination requests), other than certain correspondence to the Office of the General Counsel.