

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.

Collection of Information

This rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

The Coast Guard analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and has determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) governs the issuance of Federal regulations that require unfunded mandates. An unfunded mandate is a regulation that requires a State, local, or tribal government or the private sector to incur direct costs without the Federal government having first provided the funds to pay those costs. This rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

Taking of Private Property

This 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 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

The Coast Guard analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Security Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not pose an environmental risk to health or risk to security that may disproportionately affect children.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, 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 security, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping 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. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191, 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 604–1, 604–6, 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.

■ 2. From 8 p.m. through 10 p.m. on July 4, 2003, add § 165.T01–069 to read as follows:

§ 165.T01–069 Safety Zone: Tribute to the Troops, 4th of July Fireworks, Salem, Massachusetts.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All waters of Salem Harbor in a 400-yard radius of the fireworks launch site located on Derby Wharf located at position 42°31′04.5″ N, 70°53′05″ W.

(b) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 8 p.m. until 10 p.m. on July 4, 2003.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone will be prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Boston.

(2) All vessel operators shall comply with the instructions of the COTP or the designated on-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel. On-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, local, state, and federal law enforcement vessels.

Dated: June 18, 2003.

Brian M. Salerno,

Captain, Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Boston, Massachusetts.

[FR Doc. 03–16966 Filed 7–3–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD01–03–050]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Boston 4th of July Fireworks—Charles River, Boston, MA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for the Boston 4th of July Fireworks on July 4, 2003 in Boston, MA temporarily closing all waters on the Charles River within a four hundred (400) yard radius of the fireworks launch site. The safety zone is necessary to protect the life and property of the maritime public from the hazards posed by a fireworks display. The safety zone will prohibit entry into or movement within this portion of the Charles River during its effective period. **DATES:** This rule is effective from 7 p.m. July 4, 2003 until 11:30 p.m. on July 4, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Documents as indicated in this preamble are available for inspection or copying at Marine Safety Office Boston, 455 Commercial Street, Boston, MA between the hours of 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chief Petty Officer Daniel Dugery, Marine Safety Office Boston, Waterways Management Division, at (617) 223–3000.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) was not published for this regulation. Good cause exists for not publishing a NPRM and for making this regulation effective in less than 30 days after **Federal Register** publication. Information about this event was not provided to the Coast Guard until May 20, 2003, making it impossible to draft or publish an NPRM or a final rule 30 days in advance of its effective date. Any delay encountered in this regulation’s effective date would be contrary to public interest since immediate action is needed to prevent traffic from transiting and provide for the safety of life on navigable waters of the portion of the Charles River, Boston, Massachusetts, affected by the fireworks display. The zone should have minimal negative impact on vessel use of the

Charles River because vessels will only be excluded from the area of the safety zone for 4 and one half hours and will be able to operate in other areas of the river during this time.

Background and Purpose

Boston's Fourth of July is holding a fireworks display to celebrate the July 4th holiday. This rule establishes a safety zone on the waters of the Charles River within a four hundred (400) yard radius around the fireworks launch site located midway between the Longfellow and Massachusetts Avenue Bridges, specifically at 42°21.28' N, 071°05.00' W. All coordinates are North American Datum 1983.

This safety zone is necessary to protect the life and property of the maritime public from the dangers posed by this event. It will protect the public by prohibiting entry into or movement within this portion of the Charles River.

Discussion of Rule

The safety zone is in effect from 7 p.m. until 11:30 p.m. July 4, 2003. Marine traffic may transit safely outside of the safety zone during the event thereby allowing navigation of the entire river except for the portion delineated by this rule.

Due to the size of the river and the size of this safety zone, the Captain of the Port anticipates minimal negative impact on vessel traffic due to this event. Public notifications will be made prior to the effective period via local media, local notice to mariners and marine information broadcasts.

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).

The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this rule to be minimal enough that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

Although this rule prevents vessel traffic from transiting into a portion of the Charles River during this event, the effect of this rule will not be significant for several reasons: Vessels will only be excluded from the area of the safety zone for 4 and one half hours; although vessels will not be able to transit up and down the river in the vicinity of the

zone, they will be able to operate in other areas of the river during this time; and advance notifications will be made to the local maritime community by marine information broadcasts and Local Notice to Mariners.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Coast Guard 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 or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of the Charles River from 7 p.m. until 11:30 p.m. July 4, 2003. This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the reasons described under the Regulatory Evaluation section.

Collection of Information

This rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

The Coast Guard analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and has determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) governs the issuance of Federal regulations that require unfunded mandates. An unfunded mandate is a regulation that requires a State, local, or tribal government or the private sector to incur direct costs without the Federal Government having first provided the funds to pay those costs. This rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

Taking of Private Property

This 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 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

The Coast Guard 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 pose 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. A rule with tribal implications has 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. 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.

Environment

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

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.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping 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. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191, 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add temporary § 165.T01–050 to read as follows:

§ 165.T01–050 Safety Zone; Boston 4th of July Fireworks, Boston, Massachusetts.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone:

All waters of the Charles River within a four hundred (400) yard radius of the fireworks launch site located midway between the Longfellow Bridge and the Massachusetts Avenue Bridge, Boston, MA, specifically at 42°21.28' N, 071°05.00' W. All coordinates are North American Datum 1983.

(b) *Effective date.* This section is effective from 7 p.m. until 11:30 p.m. on July 4, 2003.

(c) *Regulations.*

(1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) Boston.

(2) All vessel operators shall comply with the instructions of the COTP or the designated on-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel. On-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, local, state, and federal law enforcement vessels.

Dated: June 10, 2003.

Brian M. Salerno,

Captain, Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Boston, Massachusetts.

[FR Doc. 03–16965 Filed 7–3–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165**

[COTP Charleston–03–105]

RIN 1625–AA00

Security Zones; Charleston Harbor, Cooper River, SC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is extending the temporary fixed security zones for the waters under the Highway 17 bridges over Charleston Harbor and the Don Holt I–526 Bridge over the Cooper River. These security zones are needed for national security reasons to protect the public and ports from potential subversive acts. Vessels are prohibited from anchoring, mooring, or loitering within these zones, unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Charleston, South Carolina or his designated representative.

DATES: This regulation is effective from 12 midnight on July 15, 2003, until 11:59 p.m. January 15, 2004. Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before September 5, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston, 196 Tradd Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29401. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston 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, are part of [COTP Charleston–03–105], will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Kevin D. Floyd, Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston, at (843) 747–7411

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Regulatory Information**

We did not publish a notice of proposed rule making (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM). Publishing a NPRM and delaying the effective date of this rule would be contrary to national

security since immediate action is necessary to protect the public, ports and waterways of the United States.

For the same reasons, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

Based on the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Arlington, VA, there is an increased risk that subversive terrorist activity could be launched by vessels or persons in close proximity to the Port of Charleston, S.C., against bridges within the security zones continued by this rule. If a bridge were damaged or destroyed, the Port of Charleston would be isolated from access to the sea, crippling the local economy and negatively impacting national security. These temporary security zones are necessary to protect the safety of life and property on the navigable waters, prevent potential terrorist threats aimed at the bridges crossing the main shipping channels in the Port of Charleston, SC and to ensure the continued unrestricted access to the sea from the Port.

A similar temporary rule was issued on October 18, 2001 creating temporary security zones around these bridges that rule expired on January 15, 2002 (*see* COTP Charleston 01–124 in Quarterly Report of temporary rules, 67 FR 9194, February 28, 2002). Those security zones were extended by another temporary rule published on February 28, 2002 (67 FR 9201) that expired on June 15, 2002. Those security zones were again extended by a temporary rule published in the **Federal Register** on July 3, 2002 (67 FR 44555) which expired on December 16, 2002. These security zones were again extended by a temporary rule published in the **Federal Register** on December 16, 2002 (67 FR 76991) and will expire on July 15, 2003.

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 to be so minimal so that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the