

opening swing movement, the channel traffic lights will flash red until the bridge returns to the fully open position. In the full open position to vessels, the bridge channel lights will flash green.

Dated: March 23, 2006.

L.L. Hereth,

*Rear Admiral, United States Coast Guard,
Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. E6-4899 Filed 4-5-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-06-024]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the drawbridge operation regulations governing the operation of the P.J. McArdle Bridge, across the Chelsea River at mile 0.3, between East Boston and Chelsea, Massachusetts. This proposed rule would allow the bridge to remain closed from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on June 17, 2006, to facilitate the Third Annual Chelsea River Revel Festival and the running of the Chelsea River Revel 5K Road Race. Vessels that can pass under the bridge without a bridge opening may do so at all times.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before May 8, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (dpb), First Coast Guard District Bridge Branch, 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts, 02110, or deliver them to the same address between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except, Federal holidays. The telephone number is (617) 223-8364. The First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 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 First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223-8364.

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 (CGD01-06-024), 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 if 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; however, you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 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

The P.J. McArdle Bridge across the Chelsea River at mile 0.3, has a vertical clearance of 21 feet at mean high water and 30 feet at mean low water in the closed position. The existing drawbridge operation regulations listed at 33 CFR 117.593 require the bridge to open on signal at all times.

On March 6, 2006, the Chelsea Creek Action Group (CCAG) requested a temporary change to the regulation that governs the operation of the P.J. McArdle Bridge. The temporary regulation would allow the bridge to remain closed to vessel traffic from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, June 17, 2006, in the interest of public safety during the Third Annual Chelsea River Revel Festival and 5K Road Race.

Vessels that can pass under the bridge without a bridge opening may do so at all times.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed change would suspend § 117.593 and temporarily add a new § 117.T594.

The P.J. McArdle Bridge would remain in the closed position from 9

a.m. to 5 p.m. in the interest of public safety during the Third Annual Chelsea River Revel Festival and the running of the Chelsea River Revel 5K Road Race.

The 5K Road Race does not actually cross over the bridge; however, the Chelsea River passes through the middle of the festival which takes place on both sides of the Chelsea River in East Boston and Chelsea.

A large volume of pedestrian traffic is anticipated to cross over the bridge during the festival.

It would not be in the best interest of public safety and the coordination of this public event to have the bridge open during the time period this event is in progress.

The Chelsea River is predominantly transited by commercial tugs, barges, oil tankers. The Coast Guard coordinates this closure annually with the oil facilities and the one recreational marina which are upstream from the bridge.

This temporary rule is expected to meet the present and anticipated needs of navigation.

Under this proposed temporary rule, all drawbridges across the Chelsea River would open on signal; except that the P.J. McArdle Bridge, at mile 0.3, would need not open for the passage of vessel traffic from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on June 17, 2006.

The opening signal for each drawbridge would remain two prolonged blasts followed by two short blasts and one prolonged blast. The acknowledging signal would remain three prolonged blasts when the draw can be opened immediately and two prolonged blasts when the draw cannot be opened or is open and must be closed.

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 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation, under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

This conclusion is based on the fact that the bridge will only be closed for 8 hours in the interest of public safety during the running of the 5K Road Race

on June 17, 2006. Vessels that can pass under the draw without a bridge opening may do so at all times during the time the bridge is closed.

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 section 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 conclusion is based on the fact that the bridge will only be closed for 8 hours in the interest of public safety during the running of the 5K Road Race on June 17, 2006. Vessels that can pass under the draw without a bridge opening may do so at all times during the time the bridge is closed.

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 us in writing at, Commander (dpb), First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, One South Street, New York, NY 10004. The telephone number is (212) 668–7165. 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 affect a 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 M16475.1D, which guides 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, this proposed rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction, from further environment documentation. Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Checklist” is not required for this rule. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether to categorically exclude this rule from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); § 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. On June 17, 2006, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., § 117.593 is suspended and a new § 117.T594 is added to read as follows:

§ 117.T594 Chelsea River.

(a) All drawbridges across the Chelsea River shall open on signal; except that the P.J. McArdle Bridge, mile 0.3, need not open for the passage of vessel traffic from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on June 17, 2006.

(b) The opening signal for each drawbridge is two prolonged blasts followed by two short blasts and one prolonged blast. The acknowledging signal is three prolonged blasts when the draw can be opened immediately and two prolonged blasts when the draw cannot be opened or is open and must be closed.

Dated: March 21, 2006.

David P. Pekoske,

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

[FR Doc. E6–4900 Filed 4–5–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

37 CFR Part 1

[Docket No.: PTO–P–2006–0005]

RIN 0651–AC01

Changes to Eliminate the Disclosure Document Program

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rule making.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) implemented the Disclosure Document Program in 1969 in order to provide an alternative form of evidence of conception of an invention to, for example, a “self-addressed envelope” containing a disclosure of an invention. It appears, however, that few, if any, inventors

obtain any actual benefit from a disclosure document, and some inventors who use the Disclosure Document Program believe that they are actually filing an application for a patent. In addition, a provisional application for patent affords better benefits and protection to inventors than a disclosure document. Therefore, the Office is proposing to eliminate the Disclosure Document Program.

Comment Deadline Date: To be ensured of consideration, written comments must be received on or before May 8, 2006. No public hearing will be held.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet addressed to ddp.comments@uspto.gov. Comments may also be submitted by mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450, or by facsimile to (571) 273–7735, marked to the attention of Catherine M. Kirik. Although comments may be submitted by mail or facsimile, the Office prefers to receive comments via the Internet. If comments are submitted by mail, the Office prefers that the comments be submitted on a DOS formatted 3½ inch disk accompanied by a paper copy.

Comments may also be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet via the Federal eRulemaking Portal. See the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site (<http://www.regulations.gov>) for additional instructions on providing comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal.

The comments will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Commissioner for Patents, located in Madison East, Tenth Floor, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, and will be available via the Office Internet Web site (address: <http://www.uspto.gov>). Because comments will be made available for public inspection, information that is not desired to be made public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine M. Kirik, Office of the Commissioner for Patents, by telephone at (571) 272–8040, by mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450, or by facsimile to (571) 273–0170, marked to the attention of Catherine M. Kirik.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: An inventor may file a disclosure document with the Office which includes a written description and drawings of his or her

invention in sufficient detail to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention to establish a date of conception of an invention in the United States under 35 U.S.C. 104 prior to the application filing date. The inventor must sign the disclosure document and include a separate signed cover letter identifying the papers as a disclosure document. A disclosure document does not require either a claim in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶2, or an inventor’s oath (or declaration) under 35 U.S.C. 115, and is not accorded a patent application filing date. A disclosure document is to be destroyed by the Office after two years unless it is referred to in a separate letter in a related provisional or nonprovisional application filed within those two years. The filing fee for a disclosure document is \$10. See 37 CFR 1.21(c).

The Office published a notice in September of 1998 seeking input from the general public on whether the Office should eliminate the Disclosure Document Program. See *Changes to Implement the Patent Business Goals*, 63 FR 53498, 53527–28 (Oct. 5, 1998), 1215 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 87 (Oct. 27, 1998) (advance proposed rule). The Office received a number of comments supporting the elimination of the Disclosure Document Program, but did not receive any input from the independent inventor community and, therefore, decided to delay eliminating the Disclosure Document Program. See *Changes to Implement the Patent Business Goals*, 64 FR 53772, 53776–77 (Oct. 4, 1998), 1215 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 87 (Oct. 27, 1998) (proposed rule). The Office has determined that it is now appropriate to propose elimination of the Disclosure Document Program because, *inter alia*, independent inventors have become more familiar with and are using provisional applications more often than they were in 1998, and provisional applications provide more protections for independent inventors than disclosure documents.

The Office implemented the Disclosure Document Program in 1969 in order to provide an alternative form of evidence of conception of an invention to forms such as a “self-addressed envelope” form of evidence. See *Disclosure Document Program*, 34 FR 6003 (Apr. 2, 1969), 861 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 1 (May 6, 1969). Since June of 1995, however, applicants have been able to file a provisional application for patent, which provides better benefits and protection to inventors than a disclosure document. A provisional application must contain a specification