CFR repeat statutory language from the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Pub. L. 91–646, 84 Stat. 1894, 42 U.S.C. 4601) (URA). Other provisions repeat language from the Department of Transportation's regulations implementing the URA. Because the requirements apply to more than one program, HUD had repeated the requirements in different program regulations. This repetition is unnecessary, and updating these scattered provisions is cumbersome and often creates confusion.

HUD would like to remove language restating requirements already imposed by statute and replace that language with citations to the specific statutory provision. In addition, HUD would propose regulatory language as necessary that would further develop the statutory requirements, but that would be useful as a single-source reference for all HUD programs. HUD anticipates that this proposed streamlining effort could eliminate approximately 30 pages of unnecessary regulations from the CFR.

Because the subject is complex, HUD anticipates that it will require considerable time and effort to craft a rule that addresses the concerns of a multitude of different program areas. The development of a streamlining proposal will require the involvement of HUD's various program offices to resolve issues such as what constitutes ''initiation of negotiations,'' what is meant by ''project'', and what should be the dates from which eligibility for relocation benefits will be recognized. Because the URA itself is so pervasive, the terms of the statute—and those of the governmentwide rule—are necessarily broad. HUD's job in streamlining its rules on relocation is to construct a matrix for implementation that is concise, as uniform as practical, and as program-specific as needed. Furthermore, any changes made in the regulations would have to be consistent with statutory authority and the Department of Transportation's government-wide rule.

HUD's various program offices have raised a number of questions about the practicality of this consolidation effort. HUD will try to streamline current relocation provisions throughout its regulations as described above; however, as part of its streamlining effort HUD is seeking public input on the consolidation of the various relocation provisions into a single part of its regulations. Therefore, by this notice the public is invited to comment on the following questions that HUD's offices have raised, and any other related matters or suggestions, including whether such a consolidation would be helpful to HUD's clients:

(1) Should HUD change the definition of ''displaced person'' to simplify its provisions or to expand or limit the circumstances under which a person will be considered displaced?

(2) In an effort to ensure some consistency between the eligibility thresholds for relocation benefits at URA and Section 104(d) levels, HUD has defined the thresholds using the same terminology, but with slight differences in the requirements applicable under the alternative (i.e., URA vs. Section 104(d)) levels of benefits. To the extent possible under the statutes, should HUD standardize these eligibility thresholds, and if so, what is the appropriate threshold: Total Tenant Payment (TTP), 30 percent of gross income, Fair Market Rent (as defined in HUD regulations), or some other threshold?

(3) Can HUD standardize other terminology used in the various program regulations on relocation? For example, can HUD define the following, or substitute, terms in a manner that could apply to most or all HUD programs: ''low-income person,'' ''low-income housing,'' ''recipient,'' and ''initiation of negotiations''?

(4) In particular, can HUD make the dates from which eligibility for relocation benefits will be recognized (a concept currently captured within the term ''initiation of negotiations'') clearer and more uniform throughout HUD's programs?

(5) Should HUD define the term ''project''?

(6) Under the current rule, is there confusion about who may appeal an agency's decision, and if so, how can HUD eliminate that confusion?

(7) How should household income be computed for purposes of calculating payments under the URA and of calculating payments and determining eligibility for Section 104(d) relocation benefits?

(8) How should HUD define ''eviction for cause'' when providing that relocation benefits do not have to be extended to persons evicted for cause?

(9) Should HUD develop a uniform standard for measuring size of units and determining replacement housing requirements?

(10) Do the current regulations accurately reflect the role of States that are CDBG grantees?

(11) Are the regulations unclear about when benefits must be paid for temporary relocation and about what constitutes a ''temporary relocation''?

(12) Should HUD reconsider its policy on minimizing displacement; if so, how should HUD change the policy; if not, what assurances should HUD require?

(13) What is the effect and usefulness of the specific requirement that displaced persons be advised of the availability of replacement housing outside areas of minority concentration?

(14) HUD is considering interpreting certain definitions in a way that would impose requirements for replacement of housing units and other relocation requirements when assisted activities result in displacement and the removal or reduction of housing stock through such events as reconfiguration of existing units and the placarding of units as unfit for human habitation, pursuant to local housing and occupancy codes under assisted code enforcement programs. Thus, for example, should HUD define the term ''demolition'' to recognize that such events may reduce the total available housing stock and displace occupants just as effectively as would actually razing structures?

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 3535(d), 4601, 5304, and 12705(b).

Dated: October 2, 1996.

Henry G. Cisneros,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–26119 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–32–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[CGD07–96–053]

RIN 2115–AE46

Special Local Regulations; Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches; Palm Beach, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish special local Regulations for the Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches. This event would be held annually during the second Saturday of December, from 6:30 p.m. until 9 p.m. EST (Eastern Standard Time). Historically, there have been approximately 60 parade event participant vessels and 200 spectator craft during the boat parade. The resulting congestion of navigable channels creates an extra or unusual hazard in the navigable waters. These proposed regulations are necessary to

provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the event.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to U.S. Coast Guard Group Miami, 100 MacArthur Causeway, Miami Beach, Florida 33139–5101, or may be delivered to the same address between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. (EST), Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is (305) 535–4448. Comments will become a part of the public docket and will be available for copying and inspection at the same address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: QM2 S.E. Fowler, Project Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Group Miami at (305) 535–4448.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Requests for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written views, data, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names, addresses, identify the notice (CGD07–96–053) and the specific section of this proposal to which their comments apply, and give reasons for each comment. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment received. The regulations may be changed in view of the comments received. All comments received before the expiration of the comment period will be considered before final action is taken on this proposal.

No public hearing is planned, but one may be held if the written requests for hearing are received, and it is determined that the opportunity to make oral presentations will add to the rulemaking process.

Discussion of Proposed Regulations

The proposed regulations are needed to provide for the safety of life on the navigable waterways during the Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches. These regulations are intended to promote safe navigation on the waters off the Palm Beaches during the parade by controlling the traffic entering, exiting, and traveling within these waters. The Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches is an annual night time boat parade consisting of approximately sixty (60) power and sail boats ranging in length from 18 to 85 feet decorated with lights. Historically, there have been approximately 60 parade event participate vessels and 200 spectator craft during the boat parade. The anticipated concentration of these spectator and parade participant vessels associated with the boat parade poses a safety concern which is addressed in these proposed special local regulations.

The boat parade would take place annually during the second Saturday of December, from 6:30 p.m. until 9 p.m. EST (Eastern Standard Time). The parade would form in the staging area in the Port of Palm Beach turning basin and then proceed south down the Intracoastal Waterway (ICW) to Lake Worth South Daybeacon 23 (LLNR 42300) where the parade would disband. The proposed regulated navigation area would include the Port of Palm Beach Turning Basin and the Intracoastal Waterway extending south from Lake Work South Lt 1 (LLNR 42170) position 26°–39.4′ N and 080°–01.2′ W, to Lake Worth South Daybeacon 23 (LLNR 42300) 26°–45.9′ N and 080°–02.9′ W.

While the parade is transiting, the proposed regulation would prohibit nonparticipating vessels from approaching within 1000 feet ahead of the lead vessel in the parade to 1000 feet astern of the last participating vessel in the parade or within 50 feet on either side of the parade unless authorized by a patrol commander. After the passage of the parade participants all vessels would be allowed to enter the regulated navigation area. A succession of not fewer than 5 short whistle or horn blasts from a patrol vessel would be the signal for any non-participating vessel to stop immediately. The display of an orange distress smoke signal from a patrol vessel would be the signal for any and all vessels to stop immediately.

Regulatory Evaluation

These proposed regulations are 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 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. Entry into the regulated area is prohibited for only 2½ hours on the day of the boat parade.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider the economic impact on the small entities for which a general notice of proposed rulemaking is required. ''Small entities'' may include (1) small businesses and not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields and (2) governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposal, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, because the proposed regulated area encompasses a limited regulated area and would restrict vessel traffic for only 2½ hours on the day of the event. If however, you think that your business or organization qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on your business or organization, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and in what way and to what degree this proposed rule would economically affect it.

Federalism

This proposal has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that the proposed rulemaking does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federal Assessment.

Environmental Assessment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this proposal consistent with Section 2.B.2. of Commandant Instruction M16475.1B, (as revised by 59 FR 38654, July 29, 1994). In accordance with that instruction section 2.B.2.b., this proposed rule has been environmentally assessed (EA completed), and the Coast Guard has concluded that it would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Specifically, the Coast Guard has consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection regarding the environmental impact of this event, and it was determined that the event does not jeopardize the continued existence of protected, threatened, or endangered species. An environmental assessment and a finding of no significant impact have been prepared and are available in the docket for inspection and copying where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

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

Proposed Regulations

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 100 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, the Coast Guard amends as follows:

PART 100—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 100 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1233, 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 100.35.

2. A new section 100.723 is added to read as follows:

§ 100.723 Annual Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches; Palm Beach, FL

(a) *Regulated Area.* A regulated navigation area is established to include the Port of Palm Beach Turning Basin and the Intracoastal Waterway extending south from Lake Worth South LT 1 (LLNR 42170), position 26°–39.4′ N and 080°–01.2′ W, to Lake Worth South Daybeacon 23 (LLNR 42300) position 26°–45.9′ N and 080°–02.9′ W.

(b) *Special Local Regulations.*

(1) While the parade is transiting, nonparticipating vessels will be prohibited from approaching within 1000 feet ahead of the lead vessel in the parade to 1000 feet astern of the last participating vessel in the parade or within 50 feet on either side of the parade unless authorized by the patrol commander. After the passage of the parade participants all vessels may enter the regulated navigation area.

(2) A succession of not fewer than 5 short whistle or horn blasts from a patrol vessel will be the signal for any nonparticipating vessel to stop immediately. The display of an orange distress smoke signal from a patrol vessel will be the signal for any and all vessels to stop immediately.

(c) *Effective Date.* These regulations become effective annually on the second Saturday of December, from 6:30 p.m. until 9 p.m. EST.

Dated: September 4, 1996.

J.D. Hull,

Acting Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 96–26149 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

---

33 CFR Part 100

[CCGD07–96–049]

RIN 2115–AE46

Special Local Regulations; Key West Super Boat Race; Key West, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish permanent special local regulations for the Key West Super Boat Race sponsored by Super Boat Racing, Inc. The Key West Super Boat Race would be held annually on the second Wednesday and Saturday in November, between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. EST (Eastern Standard Time). These proposed regulations are intended to promote safe navigation on the waters in the Atlantic Ocean in the vicinity of Key West, Florida, by controlling the traffic entering, existing, and traveling within these waters. These proposed regulations are necessary to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the event.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to U.S. Coast Guard Group Key West, Key West, Florida 33040–0005, or may be delivered to operations office at the same address between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. EST, Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is (305) 292–8727. Comments will become a part of the public docket and will be available for copying and inspection at the same address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: QMC Kent, Project Officer, USCG Group Key West, (305) 292–8727.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written views, data, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names, addresses, identify the notice (CGD07–96–049) and the specific section of this proposal to which their comments apply, and give reasons for each comment. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period. The regulations may be changed in view of the comments received. All comments received before the expiration of the comment period will be considered before final action is taken on this proposal.

No public hearing is planned, but one may be held if written requests for a hearing are received, and it is determined that the opportunity to make oral presentations will add to the rulemaking process.

Discussion of Proposed Regulations

The proposed special local regulations are needed to provide for the safety of life during the Key West Super Boat Race. These proposed regulations are intended to promote safe navigation on the waters in the Atlantic Ocean in the vicinity of Key West, Florida, by controlling the traffic entering, existing, and traveling within these waters. Historically during these races, there have been approximately 80 power boats and 100 spectator craft. The anticipated concentration of event participating vessels and spectator craft associated with the Key West Super Boat Race poses a safety concern, which is addressed in these special local regulations. The Key West Super Boat Race would be held annually from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. EST, on the second Wednesday and Saturday in November.

These proposed regulations would establish a regulated navigation area for all navigable waters within the area as bounded by the following points:

24–33.65N 081–48.47W; thence to,
24–33.95N 081–48.30W; thence to,
24–34.05N 081–48.45W; thence to,
24–33.58N 081–48.70W; thence to,
24–31.18N 081–51.10W; thence to,
24–31.18N 081–48.88W; thence to,
24–32.94N 081–48.82W.

All coordinates reference use datum: NAD 1983. Entry into this proposed regulated area would be prohibited to all vessels except event participants, unless otherwise authorized by the patrol commander. A succession of not less than 5 short whistle or horn blasts from a patrol vessel would be the signal for any non-event participating vessel to take immediate steps to avoid collision. The display of a red distress flare from a patrol vessel would be a signal for any and all vessels to stop immediately.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed regulation 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 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. Entry into the proposed regulated area would be prohibited for only 6 hours on each day of the event.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether the economic impact on small entities of a rule for which a general notice of proposed