

**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 through 1236, 49 CFR 1.46, and 33 CFR 100.35.

2. Add § 100.35T-07-121 to read as follows:

**§ 100.35T-07-121 Waverly Hotel Opening Fireworks Display, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL.**

(a) *Regulated area.* A regulated area is established 1600 feet in diameter around a barge in Biscayne Bay, FL, at approximate position 25°46.618N, 080°08.4W. All coordinates referenced use Datum NAD: 83.

(b) *Coast Guard Patrol Commander.* The Coast Guard Patrol Commander is a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by Commanding Officer, Coast Guard Station Miami Beach.

(c) *Special local regulations.* Unauthorized vessels are prohibited from entering the regulated area without the permission of the Coast Guard Patrol Commander.

(d) *Dates:* This rule is effective from 7 p.m. until 10 p.m. on November 16, 2001.

Dated: October 18, 2001.

**D.B. Peterman,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 01-26993 Filed 10-25-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-U**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 117**

[CGD01-01-142]

RIN 2115-AE47

**Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Dorchester Bay, MA**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is temporarily changing the drawbridge operation regulations that govern the William T. Morrissey Boulevard Bridge, at mile 0.0, across Dorchester Bay at

Boston, Massachusetts. This temporary change to the drawbridge operation regulations will allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2001 through May 10, 2002. This action is necessary to facilitate necessary maintenance at the bridge.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from November 1, 2001 through May 10, 2002.

**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 (CGD01-01-142) and are available for inspection or copying at the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch Office, 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts, 02110, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. John McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223-8364.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Regulatory Information**

On September 11, 2001, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Dorchester Bay, Massachusetts, in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 47123). We received no comments in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking. No public hearing was requested and none was held. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, good cause exists for making this regulation effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The Coast Guard discussed the bridge closure with the members of the only marine facility, the Dorchester Yacht Club, effected by this change in operating regulations prior to publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking and no objections were received.

The NPRM specified that we anticipated that the final rule would become effective less than 30 days following publication. Any delay encountered in this regulation's effective date would be unnecessary and contrary to the public interest since immediate action is needed to perform this project during the winter months when there have been few requests to open the bridge.

**Background and Purpose**

The William T. Morrissey Boulevard Bridge, at mile 0.0, across Dorchester Bay has a vertical clearance of 12 feet at mean high water and 22 feet at mean low water. The existing regulations at 33 CFR 117.597 require the draw to open

on signal from April 16 through October 14; except that, the draw need not open for vessel traffic from 7:30 a.m. to 9 a.m. and from 4:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. except on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays observed in the locality. From October 15 through April 15, the draw shall open on signal if at least twenty-four hours notice is given.

The bridge owner, the Metropolitan District Commission (MDC), asked the Coast Guard to temporarily change the drawbridge operation regulations to allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2001 through May 10, 2002, to facilitate rehabilitation construction at the bridge. The bridge owner and the Coast Guard contacted all known waterway users to advise them of the proposed closure. No objections or negative comments were received in response to this proposal.

**Discussion of Comments and Changes**

The Coast Guard received no comments in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking and as a result, no changes have been made to this final rule.

**Regulatory Evaluation**

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 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 Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). This conclusion is based on the fact that the only marine facility affected by this rule has agreed to the closure period for the bridge.

**Small Entities**

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612) we considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. "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 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 conclusion is based on the fact that the only marine facility affected by this rule has agreed to the closure period for the bridge.

## 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

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132 and have 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's having first provided the funds to pay those unfunded mandate costs. This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate.

## 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.

## Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation because promulgation of changes to drawbridge regulations have been found to not have a significant effect on the environment. A written "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is not required for this final rule.

## Indian Tribal Governments

This final rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have 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. 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 117

Bridges.

## Regulations

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

### PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 499; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

#### § 117.597 [Suspended]

2. From November 1, 2001 through May 10, 2002, § 117.597 is suspended.

3. From November 1, 2001 through May 10, 2002, § 117.T602 is temporarily added to read as follows:

#### § 117.T602 *Dorchester Bay.*

The draw of the William T. Morrissey Boulevard Bridge, mile 0.0, at Boston, need not open for the passage of vessel traffic.

Dated: October 12, 2001.

**G.N. Naccara,**  
*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,*  
*First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 01–26994 Filed 10–25–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09–01–140]

RIN 2115–AA97

### Security Zone; Sault Locks, St. Mary's River, Sault Ste. Marie, MI

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a security zone around the Sault Locks in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. This regulation is necessary to provide additional protection for the locks due to terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001. The security zone is intended to restrict vessel traffic movement through and around the Sault Locks.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 1 p.m. October 11, 2001 until 1 p.m. June 15, 2002.

**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 [CGD09–01–140] and are available for inspection or copying at U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Sault Ste. Marie, 337 Water St., Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** LCDR Joe Cost, Chief, Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Sault Ste. Marie, MI, (906) 635–3220.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Regulatory Information

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. The Coast Guard for good cause finds that, under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) and (d)(3), notice and public comment on the rule before the effective date of the rule and advance publication are impracticable and contrary to public interest. Immediate action is necessary to ensure the safety of life, property, the environment, as well as safe passage for vessels transiting this area. The conduct of notice and comment rulemaking proceedings and compliance with advance notice requirements present significant public security and safety concerns that outweigh the public interest in compliance with these provisions. Public rulemaking proceedings and advance publication could provoke consequences that would pose a risk of harm to the public, military personnel, and law