

### Collection of Information

This rule calls 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 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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### Taking of Private Property

This rule will not effect 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 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 rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

### Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 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 rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

### Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded 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 rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. This rule is a safety zone and therefore fits the category described in paragraph (34)(g). Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Check List” and a “Categorical Exclusion Determination” are not required for this rule.

### 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 amends 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.T07–147 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T07–147 Safety Zone; Tampa Bay, Florida.

(a) *Regulated area.* The following area is a safety zone: The waters of Garrison Channel east of an imaginary line connecting point 1: 27°56′32″ N, 082°27′58″ W; south to point 2: 27°56′27″ N, 082°27′58″ W; and including Ybor Turning Basin, Ybor Channel, and all waters in Sparkman Channel north of an imaginary line connecting point 3: 27°55′32″ N, 082°26′55″ W, east to point 4: 27°55′32″ N, 082°26′47″ W.

(b) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited to all vessels and persons without the prior permission of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Tampa or designated representative.

(c) *Date.* This rule is effective from 8:30 p.m. until 9:20 p.m. on May 29, 2005.

Dated: May 11, 2005.

**J.M. Farley,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Tampa, Florida.*

[FR Doc. 05–10588 Filed 5–26–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD01–05–050]

RIN 1625–AA00

#### Safety Zone; Wantagh Parkway 3 Bridge Over the Sloop Channel, Town of Hempstead, NY

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule; change in effective period.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is extending the effective period of a safety zone in the waters surrounding the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge across the Sloop Channel in Town of Hempstead, New York. This change will extend the effective period of the temporary final rule until December 31, 2005, allowing time for the completion of the bascule bridge being constructed over the Sloop Channel. This rule will continue to prevent vessels from transiting the Sloop Channel within 300 yards of the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge and continues to be necessary in order to protect vessels transiting in the area from hazards imposed by construction barges and equipment. Entry into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Long Island Sound, New Haven, Connecticut.

**DATES:** The extended period of § 165.T01-155 is effective from 12 a.m. on June 1, 2005 until 11:59 p.m. on December 31, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket CGD01-05-050 and will be available for inspection or copying at Group/MSO Long Island Sound, New Haven, CT, between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant A. Logman, Chief, Waterways Management Division, Coast Guard Group/Marine Safety Office Long Island Sound at (203) 468-4429.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Regulatory History**

On January 12, 2005 we published a temporary final rule (TFR) entitled "Safety Zone: Wantagh Parkway 3 Bridge Over the Sloop Channel, Town of Hempstead, NY" in the **Federal Register** (70 FR 2017). The effective period for this rule was from 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 2005 until 11:59 p.m. on May 31, 2005. We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3) and 553 (d)(3) the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM and for making this regulation effective less than 30 days after **Federal Register** publication.

Any delay encountered in this regulation's effective date would be impracticable and contrary to public interest since immediate action is needed to restrict and control maritime traffic transiting in the vicinity of the Sloop Channel under the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge in the Town

of Hempstead, Nassau County, Long Island, New York. In 2003, the Coast Guard approved bridge construction and issued a permit for bridge construction for the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge over the Sloop Channel. Contractors began work constructing the two bascule piers for the new bridge in early June 2004. A safety zone was not deemed necessary at the inception of the construction, as this channel is primarily used by smaller recreational vessels, which could maneuver outside of the channel. However, bridge construction equipment that remains under the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge poses a potential hazard greater than originally anticipated. A safety zone was deemed necessary and was established on October 9, 2004 through December 31, 2004, the date when construction impacting the navigable channel was estimated to be complete. A second safety zone was implemented from January 1, 2005 until May 31, 2005, after the New York State Department of Transportation advised the Coast Guard that construction of the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge was experiencing delays, requiring equipment to be in the channel in a manner that would leave the waterway unsafe to marine traffic until May 31, 2005. In a letter dated April 8, 2005, the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) again requested an extension of the safety zone surrounding in the Sloop Channel until December 31, 2005. The contractor for this project has experienced significant delays in bridge construction. In order to continue construction in a more rapid and safe manner, barges will need to continuously block the channel under the bridge.

The delay inherent in the NPRM process is contrary to the public interest and impracticable, because immediate action is needed to extend this safety zone to continue to prevent accidents by vessels transiting the area with the construction equipment. This is acutely necessary during the summer months, when recreational traffic will significantly increase in this area.

**Background and Purpose**

Currently, there is a fixed bridge, the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge over the Sloop Channel in the Town of Hempstead, New York. New York Department of Transportation determined that a moveable bridge would benefit the boating community. In 2003, the Coast Guard approved bridge construction and issued a permit for bridge construction for the Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge over the

Sloop Channel. Contractors began work constructing the two-basculer piers for the new bridge in early June 2004. The equipment necessary for the construction of the bridge occupies the entire navigable channel. While there are side channels, which can be navigated, the equipment in the channel is extensive and poses a hazard to recreational vessels attempting to transit the waterway via the side channels under the bridge. Construction, requiring equipment in the navigable channel, was originally scheduled to end on December 31, 2004. A second safety zone was established until May 31, 2005 after the Coast Guard was notified that the project had experienced delays in construction. Significant additional delays in construction require this equipment to occupy the navigable channel until December 31, 2005. To ensure the continued safety of the boating community, the Coast Guard is extending the safety zone in place in all waters of the Sloop Channel within 300 yards of the bridge. This safety zone is necessary to protect the safety of the boating community who wish to utilize the Sloop Channel. Marine traffic may transit safely outside of the safety zone during the effective dates of the safety zone, allowing navigation in the Sloop Channel, except the portion delineated by this rule.

**Discussion of Rule**

This regulation extends the effective period of a temporary safety zone on the waters of the Sloop Channel within 300-yards of the Wantagh Parkway Bridge. This action is intended to prohibit vessel traffic in a portion of the Sloop Channel in the Town of Hempstead, New York to provide for the safety of the boating community due to the hazards posed by significant construction equipment and barges located in the waterway for the construction of a new basculer bridge. The safety zone is being extended until 11:59 p.m. on December 31, 2005. Marine traffic may continue to transit safely outside of the safety zone during the effective dates of the safety zone, allowing navigation in the Sloop Channel, except the portion delineated by this rule. Vessels may utilize the Goose Neck Channel as an alternative route to using the Sloop Channel, adding minimal additional transit time. Entry into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Long Island Sound.

Any violation of the safety zone described herein is punishable by, among others, civil and criminal

penalties, in rem liability against the offending vessel, and license sanctions.

### Regulatory Evaluation

This 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. It is not “significant” under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We expect the economic impact of this rule will be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. This regulation may have some impact on the public, but the potential impact will be minimized for the following reasons: Vessels may transit in all areas of the Sloop Channel and other than the area of the safety zone, and may utilize other routes with minimal increased transit time.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule will 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule may affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in those portions of the Sloop Channel in the Town of Hempstead, New York covered by the safety zone. For the reasons outlined in the Regulatory Evaluation section above, this rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

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 subsection 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement

Fairness Act of 1996 [Pub. L. 104–121], the Coast Guard wants to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If this rule will affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please call Lieutenant A. Logman, Waterways Management Officer, Group/Marine Safety Office Long Island Sound, at (203) 468–4429.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

### Collection of Information

This rule calls 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 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 rule will not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### Taking of Private Property

This rule will 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 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 rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and will not concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

### Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it will 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.

To help the Coast Guard establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian and Alaskan Native tribes, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 36361, July 11, 2001) requesting comments on how to best carry out the Order. We invite your comments on how this rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a “tribal implication” under the Order.

### Energy Effects

We have analyzed this 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. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs 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 rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

#### Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph 34(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A Categorical Exclusion Determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

#### 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 amends 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 and 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. Revise temporary § 165.T01–155(b) to read as follows:

**§ 165.T01–155 Safety Zone: Wantagh Parkway Number 3 Bridge over the Sloop Channel, Town of Hempstead, NY.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) *Effective date.* This section is effective from 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 2005 until 11:59 p.m. on December 31, 2005.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: May 18, 2005.

**Peter J. Boynton,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Long Island Sound.*

[FR Doc. 05–10591 Filed 5–26–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach 03–002]

RIN 1625–AA00

#### Safety Zone; Offshore Marine Terminal, El Segundo, CA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a safety zone surrounding the El Segundo offshore marine terminal near Los Angeles, California. This action is necessary to ensure public safety and reduce the likelihood of a collision or other casualty involving a tank vessel moored at the offshore marine terminal. Entry into this zone will be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Los Angeles-Long Beach.

**DATES:** This rule is effective June 27, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach 03–002 and are available for inspection or copying at U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office/Group Los Angeles-Long Beach, Waterways Management Division, 1001 South Seaside Avenue, Building 20, San Pedro, California, 90731 between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant Peter Gooding, Chief of Waterways Management Division, (310) 732–2020.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Regulatory Information

On July 10, 2003, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled “Safety Zone; Offshore Marine Terminal, El Segundo, CA” in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 41091). We received nine letters commenting on the proposed rule. No public meeting was requested, and none was held.

##### Background and Purpose

The Chevron Texaco Shipping Company requested that the Coast Guard establish a safety zone around the El Segundo offshore marine terminal near Los Angeles, California, to promote the safety of life and property at the facility and on the adjacent waters

within the safety zone—including tank vessels and their crews, their apparatuses, and attending vessels and their crews.

El Segundo offshore marine terminal is located approximately 1 nautical mile offshore El Segundo in Santa Monica Bay, between Marina Del Rey and Redondo Beach, California. The offshore marine terminal consists of several tanker mooring buoys and seafloor pipelines connected to the mainland terminal. Large tank vessels are secured to tanker mooring buoys using multiple sets of mooring lines. Underwater pipelines that extend seaward from the mainland terminal rise up from the ocean bottom and are secured to both the buoys and the tankers. As a result, there are numerous mooring lines, pipelines, and other critical apparatuses that exist above, below, and on the surface of the water presenting an especially hazardous condition for other vessels transiting through this area. The hazards have contributed to vessel casualties resulting in pollution and in at least one case, a fatality. These conditions are present at all times, whether or not a tanker is in the offshore marine terminal.

##### Discussion of Comments and Changes

The Coast Guard received a total of nine letters in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking. What follows is a review of, and the Coast Guard’s response to, the issues and questions that were presented by these commenters concerning the proposed regulations.

(1) Four commenters indicated that buoys should be placed at the corners of the safety zone to give a visual indication to boaters passing nearby.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) publishes charts of this area. A notation of the safety zone will be placed on the chart to advise mariners of the safety zone. In addition, NOAA is publishing a new chart for the El Segundo area that will show much greater detail of the surrounding area. This chart should provide sufficient aid for boaters to identify the safety zone without the placement of buoys which may interfere with vessels permitted to enter the zone.

(2) Two commenters indicated that publication of the safety zone needed to be widespread to ensure boaters are aware of the new zone.

In addition to appearing in the **Federal Register**, news of this safety zone will be published in the Notice to Mariners, Coast Pilot, and local boating publications to ensure wide dissemination of information about this safety zone.