

than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The Port of Anchorage, Alaska recently experienced a terrorist threat of damage to the port and its personnel. We are immediately establishing this temporary security zone to protect the Port, the vessels within the Port, and its personnel from sabotage or subversive acts.

Background and Purpose

In light of a recent terrorist threat to the Port of Anchorage, the Coast Guard is establishing a security zone on the navigable waters off the Port of Anchorage to safeguard the Port, the vessels within the Port, and its personnel from sabotage or subversive acts and incidents of a similar nature. This security zone prohibits movement within or entry into the specified area.

This rule establishes a temporary 1000-yard security zone in the navigable waters of Knik Arm off the Port of Anchorage, Alaska. This security zone is designed to permit the safe loading and unloading of vessels moored at the Port and to protect its personnel from possible sabotage, subversive acts or incidents of a similar nature.

Discussion of Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary 1000-yard security zone in the navigable waters of Knik Arm off the Port of Anchorage. Specifically, the zone includes the waters of Knik Arm that are within an area bounded by a line drawn from a point located at 61°15.14' North, 149°52.78' West, then west to a point located at 61°15.14' North, 149°53.84' West, then south to a point located at 61°14.17' North, 149°54.43' West, then east to a point located at 61°13.94' North, 149°53.55' West. All cargo vessels scheduled to moor at the Port of Anchorage and that have submitted the required Advance Notice of Arrival will be allowed to transit the zone. All tow vessels contracted, specifically Cook Inlet Tug and Barge, to assist the vessels into the Port of Anchorage, may transit the security zone when actually assisting a vessel. The limited size of the zone is designed to minimize the impact on other vessels transiting to facilities near the Port of Anchorage.

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). This finding is based on the limited size of the security zone which will have minimal, if any, impact on vessels transiting the waters of Knik Arm and to facilities near the Port of Anchorage.

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 or operators of vessels intending to transit in the vicinity of the Port of Anchorage.

This security zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Marine traffic will still be able to transit through Knik Arm during the zone's activation. Additionally, vessels with cargo to load or unload at the Port of Anchorage will not be precluded from mooring at or getting underway from the Port. Tow vessels contracted to assist vessels will not be precluded from transiting the zone to assist vessels.

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 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 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 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 final 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.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D,