FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Mr. Mark Cutter, Coast Guard Sector Boston Waterways Management Division, telephone 617–223–4000, email Mark.E.Cutter@uscg.mil or Lieutenant Junior Grade Isaac Slavitt, Coast Guard First District Waterways Management Branch, telephone 617–223–8385, email Isaac.M.Slavitt@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov and will include any personal information you have provided.

Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2012–0130), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (via http://www.regulations.gov) or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via www.regulations.gov, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the Federal Register (73 FR 3316).

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one by using one of the four methods specified under ADDRESSES. Please explain why you believe a public meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the Federal Register.

Basis and Purpose


This proposed safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of spectators and vessels from hazards associated with the fireworks display.
Discussion of Proposed Rule

Ocean State Pyrotechnics, Inc is sponsoring a wedding fireworks display on the waters of Boston Inner Harbor in the vicinity of Anthony’s Pier 4, Boston, MA. The Captain of the Port (COTP) Boston has determined that fireworks displays in close proximity to watercraft and waterfront structures pose a significant risk to public safety and property. Such hazards include obstructions to the waterway that may cause marine casualties and the explosive danger of fireworks and debris falling into the water that may cause death or serious bodily harm.

Establishing a safety zone around the location of this fireworks event will help ensure the safety of spectators, vessels and other property and help minimize the associated risks. This proposed safety zone will encompass a 450-foot radius around the firework barge.

The fireworks display will occur from approximately 8:30 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. on May 19, 2012. To ensure public safety the proposed safety zone will be enforced immediately before, during, and immediately after the fireworks launch. If the event is cancelled due to inclement weather, then the proposed safety zone will not be enforced.

All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the COTP or the designated on-scene representative. Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within the regulated area is prohibited unless authorized by the COTP or the designated on-scene representative. The COTP Boston or the on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

The Final Rule will not be published 30 days before the event and the effective date of this proposed rule as is generally required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3). The Coast Guard will accept comments on this shortened period and address them in the final rule.

Public notifications will be made prior to the event via appropriate means, and may include the Local Notice to Mariners and marine information broadcasts.

Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed 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.

Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, 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 limited time that vessels will be restricted from the fireworks display area. The safety zone will be in effect for approximately three hours during the evening hours. The Coast Guard expects minimal adverse impact to mariners from the activation of the zone as information on the event will be extensively advertised in the public, affected mariners may request authorization from the COTP or the designated on-scene representative to transit the zone, and advance notification will be made to the maritime community via Local Notice to Mariners and Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed 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 proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This proposed 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 the Boston Inner Harbor in the vicinity of Anthony’s Pier 4, Boston, MA during the effective period.

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 three hours on a single day during the late evening and vessels will be able to transit around the safety zone. Before the effective period, we will issue maritime advisories widely available to users of the waterway. If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have 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 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 proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking.

If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247). The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under thePaperwork 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 proposed 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 proposed rule would not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

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

Indian Tribal Governments

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

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed 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 preliminary 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. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination will be available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES. This proposed rule involves establishment of a safety zone on the waters of the East River during a firework works display. This rule appears to be categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Commandant’s Instruction.

We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed 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 proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREA

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:


2. Add § 165.T01–0130 to read as follows:

§165.T01–0130 Safety Zone; Wedding Fireworks Display, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA.

(a) Regulated Area. The following area is a temporary safety zone: All navigable waters from surface to bottom, within a 450-foot radius of position 42°21′19″ N, 071°02′32″ W. This position is located approximately 450-feet off of Anthony’s Pier 4, Boston Inner Harbor Boston, MA.

(b) Definitions. For purposes of this section “Designated on-scene representative” is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Boston (COTP) to act on the COTP’s behalf.

(c) Effective Period. This rule will be effective and will be enforced from 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. on May 19, 2012.

(d) Regulations.

(1) The general regulations contained in 33 CFR 165.23, as well as the following regulations, apply.

(2) No vessels, except for fireworks barge and accompanying vessels, will be allowed to enter into, transit, or anchor within the safety zone without the permission of the COTP or the designated on-scene representative.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the COTP or the designated on-scene representative. 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.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the regulated area shall contact the COTP or the designated on-scene representative via VHF channel 16 or 617–223–3201 (Sector Boston Command Center) to obtain permission.

(5) Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the regulated area must comply with all directions given to them by the COTP or the designated on-scene representative.


J.N. Healey,

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

[FR Doc. 2012–7782 Filed 3–30–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 27

[WT Docket No. 12–69; FCC 12–31]

Promoting Interoperability in the 700 MHz Commercial Spectrum; Interoperability of Mobile User Equipment Across Paired Commercial Spectrum Blocks in the 700 MHz Band

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission seeks comment on whether the customers of Lower 700 MHz Band C Block licensees would experience harmful interference—and if so, to what degree—if the Lower 700 MHz band were interoperable. The Commission also explores the next steps should it find that interoperability would cause