

above-listed systems of records would impair the ability of the OTS and other law enforcement agencies to conduct investigations and inquiries into violations under their respective jurisdictions. Making accountings available to violators would alert those individuals to the fact that the OTS or another law enforcement authority is conducting an investigation or inquiry into their activities, and such accountings could reveal the geographic location of the investigation or inquiry, the nature and purpose of the investigation or inquiry and the nature of the information disclosed, and dates on which that investigation or inquiry was active. Violators possessing such knowledge would thereby be able to take appropriate measures to avoid detection or apprehension by altering their operations, transferring their activities to other locations or destroying or concealing evidence which would form the basis for prosecution or the imposition of civil sanctions.

(e) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(1) requires that an agency maintain in its records only such information about an individual as is relevant and necessary to accomplish a purpose of the agency required to be accomplished by statute or executive order. The term "maintain" as defined in 5 U.S.C. 552a(a)(3) includes "collect" and "disseminate." At the time that information is collected by the OTS there is often insufficient time to determine whether the information is relevant and necessary to accomplish a purpose of the OTS; in many cases information collection may not be immediately susceptible to a determination of whether the information is relevant and necessary, particularly in the early stages of investigation or inquiry; and in many cases information which initially appears to be irrelevant and unnecessary may, upon further evaluation or upon continuation of the investigation or inquiry, prove to have particular relevance to an enforcement program of the OTS. Further, not all violations of law uncovered during an OTS investigation or inquiry fall within the jurisdiction of the OTS; in order to promote effective law enforcement it often becomes necessary and desirable to disseminate information pertaining to such violations to other law enforcement agencies which have jurisdiction over the offense to which the information relates. The OTS should not be placed in a position of having to ignore information relating to violations of law not within its jurisdiction where that information comes to the attention of the OTS through the conduct of a lawful OTS investigation or inquiry. The OTS therefore believes that it is appropriate to exempt the above-listed systems of records from provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(1).

Dated: December 15, 1994.

Jonathan L. Fiechter,
Acting Director.

Dated: March 6, 1995.

Alex Rodriguez,
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Administration).
[FR Doc. 95-7342 Filed 3-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6720-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 162

[CGD09-95-002]

RIN 2115-AF04

Amendment to Inland Waterways Navigation Regulations Establishing Speed Limits on Connecting Waters From Lake Huron to Lake Erie

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to amend the speed limits for vessels, less than 100 gross tons, operating in the nondisplacement mode on connecting waters from Lake Huron to Lake Erie. The normal speed limits in this area are determined in large part by concerns about wake damage. However, lesser wakes are created by nondisplacement vessels and it appears that the normal speed limits unnecessarily impede their passage. The Coast Guard allowed nondisplacement vessels to operate at higher speeds under similar conditions during two temporary test periods from April 1, 1993 to November 30, 1994, with satisfactory results. The Coast Guard invites public comment on this proposed regulation.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 26, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments and supporting materials should be mailed or delivered to Lieutenant Katherine E. Weathers, Assistant Chief, Port and Environmental Safety Branch, Ninth Coast Guard District, Room 2069, 1240 E. Ninth street, Cleveland, Ohio, 44199-2060. Please reference the name of the proposal and the docket number in the heading above. If you wish receipt of your mailed comment to be acknowledged, please include a stamped self-addressed envelope or postcard for that purpose. Comments and materials received will be available for public inspection at the above location from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Katherine E. Weathers, Assistant Chief, Port and Environmental Safety Branch, Ninth Coast Guard District, Room 2069, 1240 E. Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio, 44199-2060, (216) 522-3994.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments

which may consist of data, views, arguments, or proposals for amendments to the proposed regulations. The Coast Guard does not currently plan to have a public hearing; however, consideration will be given to holding a public hearing if it is requested. Such a request should indicate how a public hearing would contribute substantial information or views which cannot be received in written form. If it appears that a public hearing would contribute to this rulemaking, the Coast Guard will announce such a hearing by a later notice in the **Federal Register**. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received before the closing date indicated above, and may amend or revoke this proposal in response to such comments.

Background and Purpose

Current regulations in 33 CFR 162.138 which apply to connecting waters from Lake Huron to Lake Erie set the maximum speed for vessels 20 meters or more in length at limits ranging from 4 to 12 statute miles per hour in various areas. One of the primary purposes of these speed regulations is to limit wake damage, but they were not written to account for the substantially lesser wake-generating characteristics of nondisplacement vessels. In fact, certain vessels designed for nondisplacement operation which have conducted test operations in the waterway would generate larger wakes at the lower speed now required because they would be forced to operate in a displacement mode. Also, the vessels which have conducted test operations in the waterway operate in a nondisplacement mode by means of a planing action on a catamaran hull, thus obtaining a hydrodynamic lift without use of projecting foils, and have demonstrated their suitability for safe operation in confined and relatively shallow areas. During the 1993 and 1994 navigation season, the Commander of the Ninth Coast Guard District temporarily amended 33 CFR 162.138 in order to allow trial runs of these nondisplacement vessels (33 CFR 162.T139, 58 FR 17526, April 5, 1993 and 59 FR 16563 April 7, 1994). A corresponding exemption was granted by the Central Region of the Canadian Coast Guard, which has authority over the Canadian waters in the same area. The two year trial period has proven successful and the Coast Guard has therefore determined that there should now be a permanent amendment to the regulations in order to prevent an unnecessary restriction on the operation of such vessels. The trial period allowed

nondisplacement vessels less than 100 gross tons to operate in the nondisplacement mode at speeds of not more than 40 statute miles per hour. During the 1993 trial period, one complaint was received alleging excessive wake. Upon investigation, it appeared that the vessel gave the impression of creating an excessive wake because of its relatively high rate of speed during a sharp turn. The Coast Guard was unable to determine if in fact an excessive wake was generated in that one case. There was no damage, and the operator agreed to modify similar maneuvers in the future in order to avoid any problem. No subsequent complaints of any kind were received by the Canadian Coast Guard or the U.S. Coast Guard. During the 1994 trial period, there were no complaints received by either the Canadian Coast Guard or the U.S. Coast Guard. It should be noted that this proposed amendment to the speed regulations for nondisplacement vessels does not in any way excuse the general obligation to exercise good seamanship when maneuvering in close quarters or the responsibility for damage which might be caused by a wake which is excessive in a location close to other vessels or shore structures.

Therefore, based on this successful trial period, and the concurrence from the Director General of the Canadian Coast Guard Central Region, the U.S. Coast Guard is now proposing a permanent change to the speed regulations.

The Coast Guard is setting an upper limit of 40 statute miles per hour for nondisplacement vessels 20 meters or more in length but less than 100 gross tons, and is allowing such nondisplacement vessels to overtake other vessels when otherwise safe. All other navigational regulations will remain in force, and the use of this special rule for nondisplacement vessels is subject to the prior approval of the Captain of the Port in order to insure that the special rule is only used by vessels which are of suitable design and which are in fact operated safely in this waterway.

Drafting Information

The principal persons involved in drafting this document are Lieutenant Katherine E. Weathers, Assistant Chief of the Port and Environmental Safety Branch, and Commander M. Eric Reeves, Chief of the Port and Environmental Safety Branch.

Environment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this regulation

and concluded that, under section 2.B.2.c of Coast Guard Commandant Instruction M16475.1B, it is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation, and has so certified in the docket file.

Federalism

This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that this regulation does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment. This regulation is not intended to preempt any state or local regulation which may also be applicable to vessels operating in the nondisplacement mode.

Regulatory Evaluation

This regulation is considered to be nonsignificant under Executive Order 12866 on Regulatory Planning and Review and nonsignificant under Department of Transportation regulatory policies and procedures (44 FR 11034 of February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e is unnecessary.

Small Entities

The economic impact of this regulation is expected to be so minimal that a full regulatory evaluation is unnecessary. Since the impact of this regulation is expected to be minimal, the Coast Guard certifies that, if adopted, it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The effect of this regulation is to ease what has now been determined to be an unnecessarily restrictive regulation as applied to one business developing the use of nondisplacement vessels in the area.

Collection of Information

This regulation will impose no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 162

Inland waterways, Navigation.

Regulations

In consideration of the foregoing the Coast Guard proposes to amend Part 162 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 162—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 162 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. In § 162.134, paragraph (f) is added to read as follows:

§ 162.134 Connecting waters from Lake Huron to Lake Erie; traffic rules.

* * * * *

(f) The prohibitions in this section on overtaking in certain areas do not apply to vessels operating in the nondisplacement mode. In this section, "nondisplacement mode" means a mode of operation in which the vessel is supported by hydrodynamic forces, rather than displacement of its weight in the water, to an extent such that the wake would otherwise be generated by the vessel is significantly reduced.

3. Section 162.138 is revised to read as follows:

§ 162.138 Connecting waters from Lake Huron to Lake Erie; speed rules.

(a) (1) *Maximum speed limit for vessels in normal displacement mode.* Except when required for the safety of the vessel or any other vessel, vessels of 20 meters or more in length operating in normal displacement mode shall proceed at a speed not greater than—

(i) 12 statute miles per hour (10.4 knots) between Fort Gratiot Light and St. Clair Flats Canal Light 2;

(ii) 12 statute miles per hour (10.4 knots) between Peche Island Light and Detroit River Light; and

(iii) 4 statute miles per hour (3.5 knots) in the River Rouge.

(2) The maximum speed limit is 5.8 statute miles per hour (5 knots) in the navigable channel south of Peche Island (under Canadian jurisdiction).

(b) *Maximum speed limit for vessels operating in nondisplacement mode.* Except when required for the safety of the vessel or any other vessel, vessels 20 meters or more in length but under 100 gross tons operating in the nondisplacement mode and meeting the requirements set out in paragraph (c) of this section, may operate at a speed not exceeding 40 miles per hour (34.8 knots)—

(1) During daylight hours (sunrise to sunset),

(2) When conditions otherwise safely allow, and

(3) When approval has been granted by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Detroit or Commander of the Ninth Coast Guard District prior to each transit of the area. In this section, "nondisplacement mode" means a mode of operation in which the vessel is supported by hydrodynamic forces, rather than displacement of its weight in the water, to an extent such that the wake which would otherwise be generated by the vessel is significantly reduced.

(c) The Captain of the Port or the District Commander may deny approval for operations under paragraph (b) of this section if it appears that the design and operating characteristics of the vessels in question are not safe for the designated waterways, or if it appears that operations under this special rule have become unsafe for any reason.

(d) *Temporary speed limits.* The District Commander may temporarily establish speed limits or temporarily amend existing speed limit regulations on the waters described in § 162.130(a).

Dated: March 1, 1995.

Rudy K. Peschel,

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Commander,
Ninth District Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 95-7370 Filed 3-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD01-95-026]

RIN 2115-AA97

Safety Zone: Brick Founder's Day Fireworks, Metedeconk River, Brick, New Jersey

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a safety zone for the Brick Founder's Day fireworks display located in the Metedeconk River, Brick, New Jersey. The safety zone would be in effect on Saturday June 3, 1995, from 8 p.m. until 10:30 p.m., unless extended or terminated sooner by the Captain of the Port, New York. The proposed safety zone would close all waters of the Metedeconk River within a 300 yard radius from the center of the fireworks platform located on Windward Beach, Brick, New Jersey.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 26, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to U.S. Coast Guard Group, New York, Bldg. 108, Governors Island, New York 10004-5096, or may be delivered to the Maritime Planning Staff, Bldg. 108, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Any person wishing to visit the office must contact the Maritime Planning Staff at (212) 668-7934 to obtain advance clearance due to the fact that Governors Island is a military installation with limited access.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant (Junior Grade) K. Messenger, Maritime Planning Staff Chief, Coast Guard Group New York (212) 668-7934.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments. A 30 day comment period is deemed to be sufficiently reasonable notice to all interested persons. Since this proposed rulemaking is neither complex nor technical, a longer comment period is deemed to be unnecessary and contrary to the public interest. Any delay in publishing a final rule would effectively cancel this event. Cancellation of this event would be contrary to public interest.

Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (CGD01-95-026) and the specific section of the proposal to which their comments apply, and give reasons for each comment. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period. It may change this proposal in view of the comments. The Coast Guard plans no public hearing; however, persons may request a public hearing by writing to the Maritime Planning Staff at the address under **ADDRESSES**. If it is determined that the opportunity for oral presentations will aid this rulemaking, the Coast Guard will hold a public hearing at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Drafting Information

The drafters of this notice are LTJG K. Messenger, Project Manager, Coast Guard Group New York and LCDR J. Stieb, Project Attorney, First Coast Guard District, Legal Office.

Background and Purpose

On February 23, 1995, the Brick Township Chamber of Commerce submitted an Application for Approval of Marine Event for a fireworks program on Windward Beach in the Metedeconk River. This regulation would establish a safety zone in the waters of the Metedeconk River on June 3, 1995, from 8 p.m. until 10:30 p.m., unless extended or terminated sooner by the Captain of the Port New York. This safety zone would preclude all vessels from transiting the Metedeconk River within a 300 yard radius of the fireworks platform located on a pier in the approximate position 40°03'25"N latitude 074°06'47"W longitude at Windward Beach, Brick, New Jersey. It is needed to protect mariners from the

hazards associated with fireworks exploding in the area.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposal is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. It has been exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. This safety zone would close a portion of the Metedeconk River to all vessel traffic on June 3, 1995, from 8 p.m. until 10:30 p.m., unless extended or terminated sooner by the Captain of the Port New York. Although this regulation would prevent traffic from transiting this area, the effect of this regulation would not be significant for several reasons. Due to the limited duration of the event; the late hour of the event; that mariners can transit to the south of this area; and the extensive, advance advisories that will be made, the Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this regulation to be so minimal that a Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposal will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. "Small entities" include independently owned and operated small businesses that are not dominant in their field and that otherwise qualify as "small business concerns" under Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

For reasons set forth in the above Regulatory Evaluation, the Coast Guard expects the impact of this proposal to be minimal. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposal will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Collection of Information

This proposal contains no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501).