petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by the Commander, Coast Guard Sector Delaware Bay.

- (2) Official Patrol means any vessel assigned or approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector Delaware Bay with a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board and displaying a Coast Guard ensign.
  - (c) Special local regulations:
- (1) Except for persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

(2) The operator of any vessel in the

regulated area must:

- (i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander or any Official Patrol.
- (ii) Proceed as directed by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander or any Official Patrol.
- (d) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 10:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. on August 23, 2006.

Dated: April 21, 2006.

#### Larry L. Hereth,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. E6–6518 Filed 4–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

# **National Park Service**

# 36 CFR Chapter 1

Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area

**ACTION:** Notice of third meeting.

Notice is hereby given, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770, 5 U.S.C. App 1, section 10), of the third meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

DATES: The Committee will meet on Monday, May 15, 2006 at the Officers's Club at 1 Fort Mason in upper Fort Mason, in San Francisco. The meeting will begin at 3 p.m. This, and any subsequent meetings, will be held to assist the National Park Service in potentially developing a special regulation for dogwalking at Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The proposed agenda for this meeting of the Committee may contain the following items; however, the Committee may modify its agenda during the course of its work. The

Committee will provide for a public comment period during the meeting.

- 1. Agenda review
- 2. Approval of April 18 meeting summary
- 3. Updates since previous meeting
- 4. No Action Alternative for Dog Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- 5. Data inventory
- 6. Information needs for Negotiated Rulemaking process
- 7. Decision-making criteria
- 8. Public comment
- 9. Adjourn

To request a sign language interpreter for a meeting, please call the park TDD line (415) 556–2766, at least a week in advance of the meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Go to the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site, http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/goga and select Negotiated Rulemaking for Dog Management at GGNRA or call the Dog Management Information Line at 415–561–4728.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meetings are open to the public. The Committee was established pursuant to the Negotiated Rulemaking Act of 1990 (5 U.S.C. 561–570). The purpose of the Committee is to consider developing a special regulation for dogwalking at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Interested persons may provide brief oral/written comments to the Committee during the Public Comment period of the meeting or file written comments with the GGNRA Superintendent.

Dated: April 18, 2006.

# Loran Fraser,

Chief, Office of Policy.

[FR Doc. E6–6486 Filed 4–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-FN-P

### **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**Forest Service** 

36 CFR Part 242

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 100

RIN 1018-AU70

Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart A; Makhnati Island Area

**AGENCIES:** Forest Service, Agriculture; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would revise the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Management Program by adding submerged lands and waters in the area of Makhnati Island, near Sitka, Alaska. This would then allow Federal subsistence users to harvest marine resources in this area under seasons, harvest limits, and methods specified in Federal Subsistence Management regulations.

**DATES:** We must receive your written public comments on this proposed rule no later than June 15, 2006.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, c/o U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attention: Thomas H. Boyd, Office of Subsistence Management; (907) 786–3888. For questions specific to National Forest System lands, contact Steve Kessler, Regional Subsistence Program Leader, USDA, Forest Service, Alaska Region, (907) 786–3888.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Background**

In Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) (16 U.S.C. 3111-3126), Congress found that "the situation in Alaska is unique in that, in most cases, no practical alternative means are available to replace the food supplies and other items gathered from fish and wildlife which supply rural residents dependent on subsistence uses \* \* and that "continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on public and other lands in Alaska is threatened \* \* \*." As a result, Title VIII requires, among other things, that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretaries) implement a program to provide for rural Alaska residents a priority for the taking for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife resources on public lands in Alaska, unless the State of Alaska enacts and implements laws of general applicability that are consistent with ANILCA and that provide for the subsistence definition, priority, and participation specified in Sections 803, 804, and 805 of ANILCA.

The State implemented a program that the Department of the Interior previously found to be consistent with ANILCA. However, in December 1989, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled in *McDowell v. State of Alaska* that the rural priority in the State subsistence statute violated the Alaska Constitution. The Court's ruling in *McDowell* caused the State to delete the rural priority from the subsistence statute which therefore