

Bulletin No. 2/41, Revision C, dated June 23, 2006.

(i) *For airplanes previously affected by AD 88-08-02*: Inspect within 12 calendar months after the last inspection required by AD 88-08-02 or within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 12 calendar months.

(ii) *For airplanes not previously affected by AD 88-08-02*: Inspect within the next 100 hours time-in-service (TIS) or 12 calendar months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 12 calendar months.

(2) *Inspection using eddy current method*: Perform the Accomplishment Instructions of Viking Air Ltd. SB No. 2/55, dated June 23, 2006.

(i) *For airplanes previously affected by AD 88-08-02*: Inspect within 12 calendar months after the last inspection required by AD 88-08-02 or within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 24 calendar months.

(ii) *For airplanes not previously affected by AD 88-08-02*: Inspect within 100 hours TIS or 12 calendar months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 24 calendar months.

(3) If cracks are found during any inspection required by either paragraph (g)(1) or (g)(2) of this AD, before further flight:

(i) Replace the complete strut assembly with a strut assembly of the same part number that has had the lower clevis fitting inspected using either the fluorescent penetrant method specified in paragraph (g)(1) of this AD or the eddy current method specified in paragraph (g)(2) of this AD and is found free of cracks; or

(ii) Replace the complete strut assembly with strut assembly C2W1115-1 or C2W1115-2, as appropriate. Installing wing strut assembly C2W1115-1 or C2W1115-2 as replacement parts terminates the recurring inspections required in paragraphs (g)(1) and (g)(2) of this AD.

FAA AD Differences

Note: This AD differs from the MCAI and/or service information as follows: No differences.

Other FAA AD Provisions

(h) The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)*: The Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, ATTN: George J. Duckett, Aerospace Engineer, 10 Fifth Street, Valley Stream, New York 11581; telephone: (516) 228-7325; fax (516) 794-5531, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. Before using any approved AMOC on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify your appropriate principal inspector (PI) in the FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO), or lacking a PI, your local FSDO.

(2) AMOCs approved for AD 88-08-02 are not approved for this AD.

(3) *Airworthy Product*: For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from

a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(4) *Reporting Requirements*: For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

Related Information

(i) Refer to MCAI Transport Canada AD CR-1985-08R4, dated September 28, 2006; and Viking Air Limited Service Bulletin S/B No. 2/41, Revision "C", dated June 23, 2006; and Service Bulletin No. 2/55, dated June 23, 2006; for related information.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 15, 2007.

David R. Showers,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E7-5215 Filed 3-21-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09-07-003]

RIN 1625-AA00

Safety Zone; Kenosha Harbor, Kenosha, WI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone in Kenosha Harbor at the east end of the south pier. This zone is intended to restrict vessels from portions of Lake Michigan and Kenosha Harbor during a fireworks display on August 11, 2007. This zone is necessary to protect the public from the hazards associated with fireworks displays.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before April 23, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander, Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan (spw), 2420 South Lincoln Memorial Drive, Milwaukee, WI 53207. The Sector Lake Michigan Prevention Department 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 Sector Lake Michigan Prevention Department between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

CWO Brad Hinken, Prevention Department, Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI at (414) 747-7154.

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 [CGD09-07-003], 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 now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the Sector Lake Michigan Prevention Department 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

This temporary safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of vessels and spectators from hazards associated with a fireworks display. Based on accidents that have occurred in other Captain of the Port zones, and the explosive hazards of fireworks, the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan has determined fireworks launches in close proximity to watercraft pose significant risk to public safety and property. The likely combination of large numbers of recreation vessels, congested waterways, darkness punctuated by bright flashes of light, alcohol use, and debris falling into the water could easily result in serious injuries or fatalities. Establishing a safety zone to control vessel movement around the location of the launch platform will help ensure the safety of

persons and property at these events and help minimize the associated risks.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

A temporary safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of spectators and vessels during the setup, loading and launching of a fireworks display in conjunction with the Kenosha Days of Discovery fireworks display. The fireworks display will occur between 8 p.m. (local) and 10 p.m. (local) on August 11, 2007.

The safety zone for the fireworks will encompass all waters of Lake Michigan and Kenosha Harbor within a 300 yard radius of position 42°35'14" N, 087°48'29" W (NAD 83).

All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or the designated on-scene representative. Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within the safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or his designated on-scene representative. The Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

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.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary.

The Coast Guard will only use this safety zone for two hours on the date specified. This safety zone has been designed to allow vessels to transit unrestricted to portions of the harbor not affected by the zone. The Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse impact to mariners from the activation of this zone.

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.

This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners of vessels intending to transits or anchor in a portion of Kenosha Harbor between 8 p.m. (local) and 10 p.m. (local) on August 11, 2007. The safety zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This rule would be in effect for only 2 hours. Vessel traffic can safely pass around the safety zone.

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 CWO Brad Hinken, Prevention Department, Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI at (414) 747–7154. 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 an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not effect the 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 and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 5100.1, which guide 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)(g) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. This proposed rule establishes a regulated navigation area and as such is covered by this paragraph.

A preliminary “Environmental Analysis Check List” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether this rule should be categorically excluded from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, 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 § 165.T09–003 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–003 Safety Zone, Kenosha Harbor, Kenosha, WI.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a temporary safety zone: all waters of Lake Michigan and Kenosha Harbor within a 300-yard radius of position 42°35′14″ N, 087°48′29″ W (NAD 83).

(b) *Effective period.* This regulation is effective from 8 p.m. (local) on August 11, 2007 to 10 p.m. (local), on August 11, 2007.

(c) Regulations.

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

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port to act on his behalf. The on-scene representative of the Captain of the Port will be aboard either a Coast Guard or Coast Guard Auxiliary vessel. The Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone shall contact the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. 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 Lake Michigan or his on-scene representative.

Dated: March 8, 2007.

Bruce C. Jones,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan.

[FR Doc. E7–5179 Filed 3–21–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2007–0170; FRL–8290–9]

Supplemental Proposed Rulemaking on 8-Hour Ozone Redesignations for Various Areas in Michigan, Ohio and West Virginia

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Supplemental proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On December 22, 2006, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated EPA’s Phase 1 Implementation Rule for the 8-hour ozone standard. This supplemental proposed rulemaking sets forth EPA’s views on the potential effect of the Court’s ruling on a number of proposed redesignation actions. This rulemaking applies to eighteen 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas in Michigan, Ohio and West Virginia, for which EPA has proposed approval of the States’ redesignation requests. For the reasons set forth in the notice, EPA proposes to find that the Court’s ruling does not alter any requirements relevant to these proposed redesignations that would prevent EPA from finalizing these redesignations. The EPA believes that the Court’s decision, as it currently stands or as it may be modified based upon any petition for rehearing that may be filed, imposes no impediment to moving forward with redesignation of these areas to attainment, because in either circumstance, redesignation is appropriate under the relevant redesignation provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and EPA’s longstanding policies regarding redesignation requests.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 6, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2007–0170 by one of the following methods:

- *www.regulations.gov:* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *E-mail:* a-and-r-docket@epa.gov.
- *Fax:* (202) 566–1741.
- *Mail:* Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 6102T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.
- *Hand Delivery:* Environmental Protection Agency, EPA West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket’s