

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 18, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Scott A. Koch, Information and Privacy Coordinator, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, DC 20505 or by telephone, 703-613-1287.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the January 8, 2007 edition of the **Federal Register**, the CIA published a proposed rule which reflected a zero-based review of its public FOIA regulations on processing fees. The proposed rule was an expansive attempt to streamline our administrative approach in order to improve our processing of FOIA requests. The proposed system contained a number of innovative features to make this new approach workable. The CIA received comments that supported some aspect of the proposed rule, while also receiving comments which were very critical of other aspects of this approach. After a review and consideration of all of the comments, it was clear that there was no way to reconcile the positive and negative comments into a refinement of our approach that was workable. We concluded that if any features of the proposed system were dropped, the advantages would not outweigh the disadvantages of adopting this system.

Since there was no support to proceed with the proposed rule as originally drafted, rather than implementing the sweeping changes set forth in the proposed rule, we have a more modest change by simply adopting the definition of “news media” contained in the March 27, 1987, Office of Management and Budget FOIA Guidelines. Although, the CIA remains confident in the adequacy and sufficiency of its previous interpretation of “news media” fee status, it has concluded that it is preferable to avoid sterile and unproductive technical litigation and the associated diversion of resources from more productive pursuits that that entails.

**List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 1900**

Classified information, Freedom of Information.

■ As stated in the preamble, the CIA is amending 32 CFR part 1900 as follows:

**PART 1900—PUBLIC ACCESS TO CIA RECORDS UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA)**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 1900 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), as amended (5 U.S.C. 552); the CIA Information Act of 1984 (50 U.S.C. 431); sec. 102 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403); and sec. 6 of the

Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403(g)).

■ 2. In § 1900.02, revise paragraph (h)(3) to read as follows:

**§ 1900.02 Definitions.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(h) \* \* \*

(3) *Representative of the News Media* refers to any person actively gathering news for an entity that is organized and operated to publish or broadcast news to the public. The term “news” means information that is about current events or that would be of current interest to the public. Examples of news media entities include television or radio stations broadcasting to the public at large, and publishers of periodicals (but only in those instances when they can qualify as disseminators of “news”) who make their products available for purchase or subscription by the general public. These examples are not intended to be all-inclusive. Moreover, as traditional methods of news delivery evolve (e.g., electronic dissemination of newspapers through telecommunications services), such alternative media would be included in this category. In the case of “freelance” journalists, they may be regarded as working for a news organization if they can demonstrate a solid basis for expecting publication through that organization, even though not actually employed by it. A publication contract would be the clearest proof, but agencies may also look to the past publication record of a requestor in making this determination:

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: July 9, 2007.

**Edmund Cohen,**

*Chief of Information Management Services.*

[FR Doc. E7-13931 Filed 7-17-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6310-02-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 165**

[CGD09-07-055]

RIN 1625-AA00

**Safety Zone; Oswego Harborfest 2007, Oswego, NY**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY. This zone is

intended to restrict vessels from a portion of Lake Ontario during the Oswego Harborfest Fireworks display on July 28, 2007. This temporary safety zone is necessary to protect spectators and vessels from the hazards associated with fireworks displays.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m. on July 28, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket CGD09-07-055 and are available for inspection or copying at U.S. Coast Guard Sector Buffalo, 1 Fuhrmann Boulevard, Buffalo, NY 14203 between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** LT Tracy Wirth, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Buffalo; (716) 843-9573.

**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. The permit application was not received in time to publish an NPRM followed by a final rule before the effective date. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Delaying this rule would be contrary to the public interest of ensuring the safety of spectators and vessels during this event and immediate action is necessary to prevent possible loss of life or property.

**Background and Purpose**

This temporary safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of vessels and spectators from hazards associated with a fireworks display. Based on accidents that have occurred in other Captain of the Port Zones, and the explosive hazards of fireworks, the Captain of the Port Buffalo has determined that fireworks launches proximate to watercraft pose a significant risk to public safety and property. The likely combination of large numbers of recreation vessels, congested waterways, darkness punctuated by bright flashes of light, alcohol use, and debris falling into the water could easily result in serious injuries or fatalities. Establishing a safety zone to control vessel movement around the location of the launch platform will help ensure the safety of persons and property at these events and help minimize the associated risks.

## Discussion of Rule

A temporary safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of spectators and vessels during the setup, loading and launching of a fireworks display in conjunction with the Oswego Harborfest 2007 fireworks display. The fireworks display will occur between 9 p.m. and 10 p.m. on July 28, 2007.

The safety zone for the fireworks will encompass all waters of Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY within a thousand foot radius of position 43°28'10" N, 076°31'04"W. [DATUM: NAD 83].

All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Buffalo or the on-scene representative. Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within the safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative. The Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

## 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. This determination is based on the minimal time that vessels will be restricted from the zone and the zone is an area where the Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse impact to mariners from the safety zone's activation.

## 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.

This rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners and operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY between 9 p.m. and 10 p.m. on July 28, 2007.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a

substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: This rule will be in effect for only one hour for this event. Vessel traffic can safely pass outside the safety zone during the event. In the event that this temporary safety zone affects shipping, commercial vessels may request permission from the Captain of the Port Buffalo to transit through the safety zone. The Coast Guard will give notice to the public via a Broadcast to Mariners that the regulation is in effect.

## 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. 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). 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 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 would 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 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 concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

## Indian Tribal Governments

The Coast Guard recognizes the treaty rights of Native American Tribes. Moreover, the Coast Guard is committed to working with Tribal Governments to implement local policies and to mitigate tribal concerns. We have determined that this safety zone and fishing rights protection need not be incompatible. We have also determined that 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. Nevertheless, Indian Tribes that have questions concerning the provisions of this rule or options for compliance are encouraged to contact the point of contact listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

## 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 procedure; and related management system 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 and Department of Homeland Security 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 determined 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 event establishes a safety zone therefore paragraph (34)(g) of the Instruction applies.

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 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, 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. A new temporary section 165.T09–055 is added as follows:

#### § 165.T09–055 Safety Zone; Oswego Harborfest 2007, Oswego, NY.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a temporary safety zone: All waters of Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY within a thousand foot radius of position 43°28′10″ N, 076°31′04″ W. [DATUM: NAD 83].

(b) *Enforcement period.* This regulation will be enforced from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m. on July 28, 2007.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in section 165.23 of this part, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port Buffalo is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Buffalo to act on his behalf. The on-scene representative of the Captain of the Port Buffalo will be aboard either a Coast Guard or Coast Guard Auxiliary vessel.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone shall contact the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. The Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

(5) Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative.

Dated: July 3, 2007.

**S.J. Ferguson,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Buffalo.*

[FR Doc. E7–13844 Filed 7–17–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2005–0050; FRL–8135–3]

#### Alachlor, Chlorothalonil, Metribuzin; Denial of Objections

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final order.

**SUMMARY:** In this order, EPA denies objections to an order denying a petition requesting the modification or revocation of the pesticide tolerances for alachlor, chlorothalonil, and metribuzin, established under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). The petition was filed on December 17, 2004, by the States of New York, California, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. The petitioners claimed that EPA had improperly removed an additional safety factor for the protection of infants and children from the risk assessments for these pesticide tolerances and that inclusion of this safety factor rendered the tolerances unsafe. EPA issued an order denying that petition, in part, on August 2, 2006. On October 2, 2006, New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts filed objections to EPA’s denial order.

**DATES:** This final order is effective July 18, 2007. Supplemental objections, as described in Unit VII.C., may be submitted on or before September 17, 2007, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2005–0050. To access the electronic docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, select “Advanced Search,” then “Docket Search.” Insert the docket ID number where indicated and select the “Submit” button. Follow the instructions on the [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) web site to view the docket index or access available documents. All documents in the docket are listed in the docket index available in [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are