Title: Aircraft Operator Security. Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

OMB Control Number: 1652–0003. Forms(s): N/A.

Affected Public: Aircraft Operators. Abstract: 49 CFR part 1544 requires aircraft operators to maintain, update, and comply with TSA-approved comprehensive security programs to ensure the freedom of movement for people and commerce by monitoring aircraft operator security procedures. These programs and related records are subject to TSA inspection.

Number of Respondents: 796. Estimated Annual Burden Hours: An estimated 1,841,130 hours annually.

Issued in Arlington, Virginia on May 20, 2010.

#### Joanna Johnson,

TSA Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Office of Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 2010-12609 Filed 5-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-05-P

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### **Coast Guard**

[Docket No. USCG-2010-0262]

## Certificate of Alternative Compliance for the Offshore Supply Vessel JANSON R. GRAHAM

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard announces that a Certificate of Alternative Compliance was issued for the offshore supply vessel JANSON R. GRAHAM as required by 33 U.S.C. 1605(c) and 33 CFR 81.18.

**DATES:** The Certificate of Alternative Compliance was issued on March 31, 2010.

ADDRESSES: The docket for this notice is available for inspection or copying at the Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket on the Internet by going to http://www.regulations.gov, inserting USCG—2010—0262 in the "Keyword" box, and then clicking "Search."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this notice, call LTJG Christine Dimitroff, District Eight, Prevention Branch, U.S. Coast Guard, telephone 504–671–2176. If you have questions on viewing or submitting

material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### **Background and Purpose**

A Certificate of Alternative Compliance, as allowed under Title 33, Code of Federal Regulation, Parts 81 and 89, has been issued for the offshore supply vessel JANSON R. GRAHAM, O.N. 1222117. Full compliance with 72 COLREGS and Inland Rules Act would hinder the vessel's ability to maneuver within close proximity of offshore platforms. The forward masthead light may be located on the top forward portion of the pilothouse 6.2 meters above the hull. Placing the forward masthead light at the height required by Annex I, paragraph 2(a) of the 72 COLREGS and Annex I, Section 84.03(a) of the Inland rules Act would result in a masthead light location highly susceptible to damage when working in close proximity to offshore platforms. Additionally, the horizontal distance between the forward and aft masthead lights may be 2.489 meters. Placing the aft masthead light at the horizontal distance from the forward masthead light as required by Annex I, paragraph 3(a) of the 72 COLREGS and Annex I, Section 84.05(a) of the Inland Rules Act would result in an aft masthead light location directly over the aft cargo deck where it would interfere with loading and unloading operations.

The Certificate of Alternative Compliance allows for the vertical placement of the forward masthead light to deviate from requirements set forth in Annex I, paragraph 2(a) of 72 COLREGS and Annex I, Section 84.03(a) of the Inland Rules Act. In addition the Certificate of Alternative Compliance allows for the horizontal separation of the forward and aft masthead lights to deviate from the requirements of Annex I, paragraph 3(a) of 72 COLREGS and Annex I, Section 84.05(a) of the Inland Rules Act.

Dated: 15 April 2010.

### J. W. Johnson,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard Chief, Inspections and Investigations Branch By Direction of the Commander Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2010-12602 Filed 5-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

# Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA-2010-0031]

## Recovery Policy RP9526.1, Hazard Mitigation Funding Under Section 406 (Stafford Act)

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS. **ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides notice of the final Recovery Policy RP9526.1, *Hazard Mitigation Funding Under Section 406 (Stafford Act)*, which is being issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

**DATES:** This policy is effective March 30, 2010.

ADDRESSES: This final policy is available online at http://www.regulations.gov under docket ID FEMA-2010-0031 and on FEMA's Web site at http://www.fema.gov. You may also view a hard copy of the final policy at the Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Room 835, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20472-3100.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lu Juana Richardson, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20472, via e-mail at LuJuana.Richardson@dhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This policy provides guidance on the appropriate use of hazard mitigation discretionary funding available under Section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act), 42 U.S.C. 5172. This will ensure national consistency in the use of Section 406 mitigation funds and promote measures that reduce future loss to life and property, protect the Federal investment in public infrastructure and ultimately help build disaster-resistant communities.

FEMA has revised this policy to reflect the alignment of benefit cost analysis methodologies between the Mitigation and Recovery Directorates. In order to achieve consistency across program areas and to maximize FEMA's ability to support and encourage costeffective hazard mitigation, the Public Assistance Division has adopted the Mitigation Directorate's Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) methodology for Section 406 hazard mitigation projects. Previously, the only benefits considered in the BCA were damage to the facility