via U.S. Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan on VHF channel 16.

This document is issued under authority of 33 CFR 165.930 and 5 U.S.C. 552(a). In addition to this publication in the Federal Register, the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan will also provide notice through other means, which may include Broadcast Notice to Mariners, Local Notice to Mariners, local news media, distribution in leaflet form, and on-scene oral notice. Additionally, the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan may notify representatives from the maritime industry through telephonic and email notifications.

Dated: June 30, 2015.
A.B. Cocanour,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Lake Michigan.
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DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2015–0595]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Town of Olcott Fireworks Display; Lake Ontario, Olcott, NY

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on Lake Ontario, Olcott, NY. This safety zone is intended to restrict vessels from a portion of Lake Ontario during the Town of Olcott fireworks display. This temporary safety zone is necessary to protect mariners and vessels from the navigational hazards associated with a fireworks display.

DATES: This rule is effective without actual notice from July 16, 2015 until September 6, 2015. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from June 25, 2015 until July 16, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket [USCG–2015–0595]. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to http://www.regulations.gov, type the docket number in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email LTJG Amanda Garcia, Chief of Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Buffalo; telephone 716–843–9343, email SectorBuffaloMarineSafety@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing the docket, call Ms. Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826 or 1–800–647–5527.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Acronyms

DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
TFR Temporary Final Rule

A. Regulatory History and Information

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary final rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(2), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because doing so would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest. The final details for this event were not known to the Coast Guard until there was insufficient time remaining before the event to publish an NPRM. Thus, delaying the effective date of this rule to wait for a comment period to run would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest because it would inhibit the Coast Guard’s ability to protect spectators and vessels from the hazards associated with a maritime fireworks display. Therefore, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this temporary rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the Federal Register. For the same reasons discussed in the preceding paragraph, waiting for a 30 day notice period to run would be impracticable.

B. Basis and Purpose

The legal basis and authorities for this rule are found in 33 U.S.C. 1231, 46 U.S.C. Chapter 75, 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to establish and define regulatory safety zones.

Between 9:30 p.m. and 11 p.m. on July 10, 2015; July 23, 2015; August 13, 2015; August 27, 2015; and September 6, 2015, a fireworks display will be held on the shoreline of Lake Ontario in Olcott, NY. It is anticipated that numerous vessels will be in the immediate vicinity of the launch point. The Captain of the Port Buffalo has determined that such a launch proximate to a gathering of watercraft pose a significant risk to public safety and property. Such hazards include premature and accidental detonations, dangerous projectiles, and falling or burning debris.

D. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes and executive orders.

1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is not a significant regulatory action action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13532. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders.
We conclude that this rule is not a significant regulatory action because we anticipate that it will have minimal impact on the economy, will not interfere with other agencies, will not adversely alter the budget of any grant or loan recipients, and will not raise any novel legal or policy issues. The safety zone created by this rule will be relatively small and enforced for a relatively short time. Also, the safety zone is designed to minimize its impact on navigable waters. Furthermore, the safety zone has been designed to allow vessels to transit around it. Thus, restrictions on vessel movement within that particular area are expected to be minimal. Under certain conditions, moreover, vessels may still transit through the safety zone when permitted by the Captain of the Port.

2. Impact on Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered the impact of this rule on 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. 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 might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of Lake Ontario on the evening of July 10, 2015; July 23, 2015; August 13, 2015; August 27, 2015; and September 6, 2015.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: This safety zone would be effective, and thus subject to enforcement, for only 90 minutes late in the day. Traffic may be allowed to pass through the zone with the permission of the Captain of the Port. The Captain of the Port can be reached via VHF channel 16. Before the enforcement of the zone, we would issue local Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

3. 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 rule. 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 in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section above.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small businesses. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247). 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.

4. Collection of Information

This rule will not call for a new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

5. Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism.

6. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

7. 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 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

8. Taking of Private Property

This rule will not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

9. 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.

10. Protection of Children

We have 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 create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

11. Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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.

12. Energy Effects

This action is not a “significant energy action” under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

13. Technical Standards

This rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

14. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule involves the establishment of a safety zone and, therefore it is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under
AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 Waterways.

impact from this rule.

discovery of a significant environmental information that may lead to the

Olcott, NY.

Olcott Fireworks Display; Lake Ontario,

§ 165.T09–0595 Safety Zone; Town of

2. Add § 165.T09–0595 to read as

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:


2. Add § 165.T09–0595 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–0595 Safety Zone; Town of Olcott Fireworks Display; Lake Ontario, Olcott, NY.

(a) Location. This zone will encompass all waters of Lake Ontario; Olcott, NY within a 1,050-foot radius of position 43°20′23.6″ N. and 78°43′09.5″ W. (NAD 83).

(b) Enforcement period. This regulation will be enforced on July 10, 2015; July 23, 2015; August 13, 2015; August 27, 2015; and September 6, 2015 from 9:30 p.m. until 11 p.m.

(c) Regulations. (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port Buffalo is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Buffalo to act on his behalf.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone must contact the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. The Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his on-scene representative.

Dated: June 25, 2015.

B.W. Roche,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Buffalo.

[FR Doc. 2015–17483 Filed 7–15–15; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 4
RIN 2900–AP38

Agency Interpretation of Prosthetic Replacement of a Joint

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Veterans Affairs is publishing interpretive guidance for diagnostic codes (DC) 5051 through 5056, which establish rating criteria for prosthetic implant replacements of joints of the musculoskeletal system. The Schedule for Rating Disabilities under these DCs allows for a 1-year, 100-percent disability evaluation upon prosthetic replacement of a joint. This final rule clarifies that VA’s longstanding interpretation of DCs 5051 through 5056 is that a 100-percent evaluation will be in place for a period of one year when the total joint, rather than the partial joint, has been replaced by a prosthetic implant.

DATES: Effective Date: This final rule is effective July 16, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Stephanie Li, Chief, Regulations Staff (211D), Compensation Service, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 461–9700. (This is not a toll-free telephone number.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Diagnostic codes (DCs) 5051 through 5056, under 38 CFR 4.71a, govern the Schedule for Rating Disabilities (Rating Schedule) for prosthetic replacement of joints under the musculoskeletal system. These DCs state that a 100-percent evaluation will be sustained for 1 year following the prosthetic replacement of the named joint. This period of total disability evaluation is designed to provide temporary convalescence for major surgery, such as total joint replacement. Following the convalescent period, a Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) or VA-approved examination is conducted to determine any residual disability, and a new rating evaluation is assigned based on such residuals.

The field of orthopedic medicine has progressed to such a degree that total prosthetic replacement of a joint is not always necessary. Surgical procedures, sometimes referred to generally as “joint replacements,” may only require partial replacement of the disabled joint.1 Partial replacement has the benefit of not requiring the same length of time for convalescence.2 The progression of this area of medical science has raised an issue as to whether a veteran who undergoes a partial replacement of a joint is entitled to the 100-percent rating evaluation during the convalescent period under DCs 5051 through 5056.

VA has long interpreted “joint replacement,” as used in § 4.71a, to mean total joint replacement. Recently, the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (Veterans Court) issued a precedential panel decision upholding VA’s interpretation of § 4.71a. In Hudgens v. Gibson, 26 Vet. App. 558 (2014), the Veterans Court upheld the Board of Veterans’ Appeals decision that DC 5055 applies only to total knee prosthetic replacements. The Veterans Court determined that the plain language of DC 5055 was unambiguous.

Id. at 561. The Veterans Court found that the medical definition of “knee joint” encompassed three distinct compartments of the knee and that “[n]othing in the plain language of the regulation indicates that it applies to replacements of less than a complete knee joint . . . ”. Id. In addition, the Veterans Court cited DC 5054, for hip joint prosthesis, as an example of when VA intends to evaluate partial joint replacement. Diagnostic Code 5054, also under § 4.71a, provides evaluation criteria for “[p]rosthetic replacement of the head of the femur or of the acetabulum” (italics added), which together make up the hip joint. Id. The Veterans Court concluded that “DC 5055 applies only to total knee replacements, as the Secretary has demonstrated in other parts of § 4.71(a) [sic] that he is aware of how to include partial joint replacements as part of disability rating criteria in other parts of § 4.71(a) [sic].” Id. at 562.

In view of the above court decision, and VA’s longstanding interpretation, VA is amending its regulations to clarify that the language of § 4.71a, Prosthetic Implants, which refers to replacement of

1 Patients with osteoarthritis that is limited to just one part of the knee may be candidates for unicompartmental knee replacement (also called a ‘partial’ knee replacement).2 “Unicompartmental Knee Replacement,” American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, Ortho Info, 1 (June 2010), http://orthoinfo.aaos.org/topic.cfm?topic=a00585 (last visited Mar. 19, 2014).

2 Id.