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.lD, and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 5100.1 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)(h), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine event permit are specifically excluded from further analysis and documentation under those sections.

## List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

# PART 100—SAFETY OF LIFE ON NAVIGABLE WATERS

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 100 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1233.

 $\blacksquare$  2. Add temporary § 100.35–T05–028 to read as follows:

# § 100.35-T05-028 Roanoke River, Plymouth, North Carolina.

- (a) Regulated area. The regulated area includes all waters of Roanoke River commencing at the north river bank at latitude 35°52′20″ N, longitude 076°44′47″ W, thence a line 180 degree due south across the river to the shoreline thence west along the shoreline to a position located at latitude 35°51′43″ N, longitude 076°43′45″ W, thence 000 degrees due north across the river to the shoreline thence east along the shoreline to the point of origin. All coordinates reference Datum NAD 1983.
  - (b) Definitions:
- (1) Coast Guard Patrol Commander means a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by the Commander, Coast Guard Sector North Carolina.
- (2) Official Patrol means any vessel assigned or approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector North Carolina 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 shall:
- (i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any Official Patrol.
- (ii) Proceed as directed by any official patrol.
- (d) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 10 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. on May 6, 2007.

Dated: March 20, 2007.

## Larry L. Hereth,

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

[FR Doc. E7–6096 Filed 4–2–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### **Coast Guard**

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD05-06-105]

RIN 1625-AA87

Security Zone; Georgetown Channel, Potomac River, Washington, DC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a permanent security zone on the waters of the upper Potomac River. This action is necessary to provide for the security of a large number of visitors to the annual July 4th celebration on the National Mall in Washington, DC. The security zone will allow for control of a designated area of the river and safeguard spectators and high-ranking officials.

**DATES:** This rule is effective May 3, 2007.

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 CGD05–06–105 and are available for inspection or copying at Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ronald Houck, at Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, at telephone number (410) 576–2674 or (410) 576–2693.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Regulatory Information**

On December 1, 2006, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled "Security Zone; Georgetown Channel, Potomac River, Washington, DC" in the Federal Register (71 FR 69517). We received no letters commenting on the proposed rule. No public meeting was requested, and none was held.

## **Background and Purpose**

Due to increased awareness that future terrorist attacks are possible, including continued threats against U.S. interests by Al-Queda and other terrorist organizations, the Coast Guard, as lead federal agency for maritime homeland security has, determined that the Captain of the Port Baltimore must have the means to be aware of, deter, detect, intercept, and respond to asymmetric threats, acts of aggression, and attacks by terrorists on the American homeland while still maintaining our freedoms and sustaining the flow of commerce. This security zone is part of a comprehensive port security regime designed to safeguard human life, vessels, and waterfront facilities against sabotage or terrorist attacks.

In this particular rulemaking, to address the aforementioned security concerns, and to take steps to prevent the catastrophic impact that a terrorist attack against a large number of spectators and high-ranking officials during the annual July 4th celebration

would have on the public interest, the Coast Guard is proposing to establish a security zone upon all waters of the Georgetown Channel of the Potomac River, from the surface to the bottom, 75 vards from the eastern shore measured perpendicularly to the shore, between the Long Railroad Bridge (the most eastern bridge of the 5-span, Fourteenth Street Bridge Complex) to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge and all waters in between, totally including the waters of the Georgetown Channel Tidal Basin. This security zone will help the Coast Guard to prevent vessels or persons from engaging in terrorist actions against a large number of spectators and high-ranking officials during the annual July 4th celebration. Due to these heightened security concerns, and the catastrophic impact a terrorist attack on the National Mall in Washington, DC during the annual July 4th celebration would have on the large number of spectators and high-ranking officials, as well as the surrounding area and communities, a security zone is prudent for this type of event.

## **Discussion of Comments and Changes**

The Coast Guard received no comments on the proposed rule during the comment period published in the NPRM. No public meeting was requested and none was held. As a result, no change from the proposed regulatory text was made.

## **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. The security zone is of limited size, located along the shoreline, and will only be enforced for one day of the year, resulting in minimal disruption to the maritime community.

The Coast Guard received no comments on this aspect of the proposed rule during the comment period published in the NPRM. As a result, no change to the proposed regulatory text was made.

## **Small Entities**

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to operate, remain or anchor in a portion of the Potomac River, within 75 yards from the eastern shore measured perpendicularly to the shore, between the Long Railroad Bridge (the most eastern bridge of the 5-span, Fourteenth Street Bridge Complex) to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge and all waters in between, totally including the waters of the Georgetown Channel Tidal Basin from 12:01 a.m. to 11:59 p.m. annually on July 4th. This security zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. The zone is of limited size and located along the shoreline, therefore, it is expected that there will be minimal disruption to the maritime community. Before the enforcement period, the Coast Guard will issue maritime advisories widely available to users of the Potomac River.

The Coast Guard received no comments on this aspect of the proposed rule during the comment period published in the NPRM. As a result, no change to the proposed regulatory text was made.

## **Assistance for Small Entities**

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. However, we received no requests for assistance from any small entities.

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 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.lD 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 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 regulation establishes a security zone. A final "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a final "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are 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 is revised 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, 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 § 165.508 to read as follows:

# § 165.508 Security Zone; Georgetown Channel, Potomac River, Washington, DC.

- (a) Definitions. (1) The Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland means the Commander, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Maryland or any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer who has been authorized by the Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland to act on his or her behalf.
- (b) Location. The following area is a security zone: All waters of the Georgetown Channel of the Potomac River, from the surface to the bottom, 75 yards from the eastern shore measured perpendicularly to the shore, between the Long Railroad Bridge (the most eastern bridge of the 5-span, Fourteenth Street Bridge Complex) to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge and all waters in between, totally including the waters of the Georgetown Channel Tidal Basin.
- (c) Regulations. (1) All persons are required to comply with the general regulations governing security zones found in § 165.33 of this part.
- (2) Entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland.
- (3) Persons or vessels requiring entry into or passage through the security zone must first request authorization from the Captain of the Port, Baltimore to seek permission to transit the area. The Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland can be contacted at telephone number (410) 576-2693. The Coast Guard vessels enforcing this section can be contacted on VHF Marine Band Radio, VHF channel 16 (156.8 MHz). Upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland and proceed at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course while within the zone.

(d) Enforcement. The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the zone by Federal, State, and local agencies.

(e) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 12:01 a.m. to 11:59 p.m. local time annually on July

Dated: March 16, 2007.

#### Brian D. Kelley,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the

Port, Baltimore, Maryland.

[FR Doc. E7-6097 Filed 4-2-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### **Coast Guard**

33 CFR Part 165

[CCGD05-07-024]

RIN 1625-AA00

Safety Zone: Celebration 2007, Appomattox River, Hopewell, VA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS. **ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a 600 foot radius safety zone in the vicinity of Hopewell, VA centered on position 37°–19′–11″ N/077°–16′–55″ W on May 12, 2007 in support of the Celebration 2007 event. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic movement on the Appomattox River to protect mariners from the hazards associated with fireworks displays.

DATES: This rule is effective from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on May 12, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket [CGD05–07–024] and are available for inspection or copying at Coast Guard Sector Hampton Roads, Norfolk Federal Building, 200 Granby St., 7th Floor, Norfolk, VA 23510 between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Junior Grade TaQuitia Winn, Assistant Chief, Waterways Management Division, Sector Hampton Roads at (757) 668–5580.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## **Regulatory Information**

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM.

Insufficient time existed for publication of an NPRM and a final rule. Delaying this rule would be contrary to the public interest since immediate action is needed to minimize potential danger to the public during the fireworks demonstration.

### **Background and Purpose**

On May 12, 2007, the city of Hopewell, VA will sponsor a fireworks display on the Appomattox River at position 37°–19′–11″ N/077°–16′–55″ W. Due to the need to protect mariners and spectators from the hazards associated with the fireworks display, vessel traffic will be temporarily restricted within a 600 foot radius of the fireworks barge.

## Discussion of Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a 600 foot radius safety zone on specified waters of the Appomattox River around the fireworks barge, centered on position 37°-19'-11" N/077°-16'-55" W in the vicinity of City Point, Hopewell, VA. This safety zone will be established in the interest of public safety during the Celebration 2007 event and will be enforced from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on May 12, 2007. General navigation within the safety zone will be restricted during the specified date and times. Except for participants and vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

## 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. Although this regulation restricts access to the safety zone, the effect of this rule will not be significant because: (i) The safety zone will be in effect for a limited duration; and (ii) the Coast Guard will make notifications via maritime advisories so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this 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 rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the zone will only be in place for a limited duration and maritime advisories will be issued allowing the mariners to adjust their plans accordingly. However, this rule may affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners and operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in that portion of the Appomattox River subject to this rule from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on May 12, 2007.

If you think the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Lieutenant Junior Grade TaQuitia Winn, Assistant Chief, Waterways
Management Division, Sector Hampton Roads at (757) 668–5580.

## 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 the rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking.

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 action by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247). 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 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