

### 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**.

### Background and Purpose

The existing regulations of the 63rd Street bridge, mile 4.0, Miami-Dade County is published in 33 CFR 117.5 and requires the span to open on signal.

On January 17, 2006, the owner of the bridge requested that the Coast Guard temporarily change the existing regulations of the 63rd Street Bridge to allow for rehabilitation in a safe and efficient manner. The bridge closure dates detailed below have been staggered to allow for the movement of navigation before and after each closure period.

### Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed temporary rule would require the draw of the 63rd Street bridge, mile 4.0 across Indian Creek, Miami-Dade County, Florida to open as necessary a single-leaf on the hour from 8 a.m. to 12:10 a.m. and to remain closed from 12:11 a.m. to 7:59 a.m. except that from July 14 to July 17, 2006, August 1 to August 4, 2006, January 10 to January 13, 2007, and January 29 to February 1, 2007, the bridge will be closed to navigation.

From June 19 to June 24, July 5 to July 10, December 4 to December 9, and December 18 to December 23, 2006 the waterway will remain closed to navigation except for hourly openings as necessary between 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

The bridge closure dates have been staggered to allow for the movement of navigation before and after each closure period.

### Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed temporary 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 temporary rule would modify the existing bridge schedule to allow for the rehabilitation of the bridge 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 temporary 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 temporary rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed temporary rule would affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels needing to transit from the marinas on the south of the bridge to the Intracoastal Waterway, persons intending to drive over the bridge and nearby business owners.

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 (Public Law 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

#### Environment

We have analyzed this proposed temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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. Add § 117.T293 to read as follows:

#### § 117.T293 Indian Creek.

(a) The draw of the 63rd Street bridge, mile 4.0 across Indian Creek, Miami-Dade County, Florida will open a single-leaf as necessary on the hour from 8 a.m. to 12:10 a.m. and will remain closed from 12:11 a.m. to 7:59 a.m. except that the bridge will be closed to navigation on the following dates: July 14 to July 17, 2006; August 1 to August 4, 2006; January 10 to January 13, 2007; and January 29 to February 1, 2007.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a) of this section, from June 19 to June 24, July 5 to July 10, December 4 to December 9, and December 18 to December 23, 2006 the waterway will be closed to navigation except for hourly openings as necessary between 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

(c) Effective date: This temporary rule is effective from 8 a.m. on June 19, 2006 through 6 p.m. on February 5, 2007.

Dated: March 15, 2006.

**D.B. Peterman,**

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

[FR Doc. E6–4786 Filed 3–31–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD05–06–014]

RIN 1625-AA87

#### Security Zone; Georgetown Channel, Potomac River, Washington, DC

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary security zone on the waters of the upper Potomac River. This action is necessary to provide for the security of a large number of visitors to the annual July 4th celebration on the National Mall in Washington, DC. The security zone will allow for control of a designated area of the river and safeguard spectators and high-ranking officials.

**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, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, 2401 Hawkins Point Road, Building 70, Waterways Management Division, Baltimore, Maryland 21226–1791. Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways

Management Division, 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 Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Ronald Houck, at Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, at telephone number (410) 576–2674 or (410) 576–2693.

#### 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 (CGD05–06–014), 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 Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, 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 separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

#### Background and Purpose

Due to increased awareness that future terrorist attacks are possible, including continued threats against U.S. interests by Al-Queda and other terrorist organizations, the Coast Guard as lead federal agency for maritime homeland security, has determined that the Captain of the Port Baltimore must have the means to be aware of, deter, detect, intercept, and respond to asymmetric threats, acts of aggression, and attacks by terrorists on the American homeland while still maintaining our freedoms and sustaining the flow of commerce.