located at 42°32.5′ N, 82°40.1′ W extending west to the Old Channel Light located at position 42°32.5′ N, 82°41.6′ W angling northeast to position 42°33.5′ N, 82°40.6′ W then angling southeast to the point of origin creating a triangle shaped safety zone from 1:30 p.m. until 4:30 p.m. on October 15, 2011. This area is near the southern end of Harsens Island in Muscamoot Bay. All geographic coordinates are North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83).

(b) Effective and Enforcement Period. This rule is effective and will be enforced from 1:30 p.m. through 4:30 p.m. on October 15, 2011.

(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 Detroit, or his designated on-scene representative.

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

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

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone shall contact the Captain of the Port Detroit or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so.

(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 or his on-scene representative.

Dated: September 26, 2011.

J.E. Ogden,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Detroit.
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security zone discussed above, will be located in the vicinity of the Jardine Water Treatment Plant Chicago, Illinois. The Jardine Water Filtration Plant security zone will encompass all U.S. navigable waters of Lake Michigan within an arc of a 100-yard radius with its center located on the approximate position 41°53′46″ N, 087°36′23″ W. The second new security zone is located in the vicinity of the Wilson Avenue Crib, Chicago, Illinois. It encompasses all U.S. navigable waters of Lake Michigan within the arc of a circle with a 100-yard radius with its center in approximate position 41°58′00″ N, 087°35′30″ W.

The third new security zone is located in the vicinity of the new Four Mile Intake Crib in Chicago, Illinois. It encompasses all U.S. navigable waters of Lake Michigan within the arc of a circle with a 100-yard radius with its center in approximate position 41°52′40″ N, 087°32′45″ W. In accordance with 33 CFR 165.33, no person or vessel may enter or remain in one of the security zones discussed in this rule without permission of the Captain of the Port Sector Lake Michigan. The Captain of the Port Sector Lake Michigan, at his or her discretion, may permit persons and vessels to enter the security zones addressed in this rule. For instance, the Captain of the Port Sector Lake Michigan may permit those U.S. Coast Guard certified passenger vessels that normally load and unload passengers at the north side of Navy Pier to operate in the Jardine Water Filtration Plant security zone.

Regulatory Analyses

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

Regulatory Planning and Review

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 conclude that this rule is not a significant regulatory action because we anticipate that it will have minimal impact on the economy, will not interfere with other agencies, will not adversely alter the budget of any grant or loan recipients, and will not raise any novel legal or policy issues. The security zones amended and established by this rule will be relatively small and enforced for relatively short time. Also, each security zone is designed to minimize its impact on navigable waters. Furthermore, each security zone has been designed to allow vessels to transit unrestricted to portions of the waterways not affected by the security zones. Thus, restrictions on vessel movements within that particular area are expected to be minimal. Under certain conditions, moreover, vessels may still transit through each security zone when permitted by the Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan. On the whole, the Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse impact to mariners from the activation of these security zones.

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 might be small entities: The owners and operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in the security zones addressed in this rule. These security zones will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: The security zones in this rule would be in small areas surrounding the intake cribs or areas near shore to Chicago’s water filtration plants; the security zones have been designed to allow traffic to pass safely around these zones whenever possible.

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

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 (adjusted for inflation) 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 affect the 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 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 Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a determination that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES. This rule involves the establishment, disestablishment, and changing of security zones, and thus, paragraph 34(g) of figure 2–1 in Commandant Instruction M16475.1D applies.

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

§ 165.904 Lake Michigan at Chicago Harbor & Burnham Park Harbor—Safety and Security Zone.

(a) Location. All waters of Lake Michigan within Burnham Park Harbor shoreward of a line across the entrance of the harbor connecting coordinates 41°51′09″ N, 87°36′36″ W and 41°51′11″ N, 87°36′22″ W.

(b) Security Zones; Captain of the Port Lake Michigan.

(i) Jardine Water Filtration Plant. Location. All waters of Lake Michigan within the arc of a 100-yard radius with its center located on the north wall of Jardine Water Filtration Plant, approximate position 41°53′46″ N, 87°36′23″ W; (NAD 83)

(ii) Wilson Avenue Intake Crib. All waters of Lake Michigan within the arc of a circle with a 100-yard radius of the Wilson Avenue Crib with its center in approximate position 41°58′00″ N, 87°35′30″ W; (NAD 83)

(iii) Four Mile Intake Crib. All waters of Lake Michigan within the arc of a circle with a 100-yard radius of the Four Mile Crib with its center in approximate position 41°52′40″ N, 87°32′45″ W; (NAD 83)

Dated: September 27, 2011.

M.W. Sibley,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Lake Michigan.

[FR Doc. 2011–25125 Filed 10–11–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 679

[Docket No. 101126521–0640–02]

RIN 0648–XA757

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Yellowfin Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Temporary rule; reallocation.

SUMMARY: NMFS is reallocating the projected unused amount of the 2011 yellowfin sole total allowable catch (TAC) assigned to the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands trawl limited access sector to the Amendment 80 cooperative in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management area (BSAI). This action is necessary to allow the total 2011 allowable catch of yellowfin sole to be fully harvested.

DATES: Effective October 6, 2011, through 2400 hrs, Alaska local time (A.l.t.), December 31, 2011.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS manages the groundfish fishery in the BSAI according to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (FMP) prepared by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council under authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Regulations governing fishing by U.S. vessels in accordance with the FMP appear at subpart H of 50 CFR part 600 and 50 CFR part 679.

The 2011 yellowfin sole TAC assigned to the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands trawl limited access sector is 34,153 metric tons (mt) and to the Amendment 80 cooperative is 138,875 mt as established by the final 2011 and 2012 harvest specifications for groundfish in the BSAI (76 FR 11139, March 1, 2011). The Administrator, Alaska Region, NMFS, has determined that 2,000 mt of the yellowfin sole TAC assigned to the BSAI trawl limited access sector will not be harvested. Therefore, in accordance with § 679.91(f), NMFS reallocates 2,000 mt of yellowfin sole from the BSAI trawl limited access sector to the Amendment 80 cooperatives in the BSAI.