

proposed change will apply to the following bridges and during the following times:

Craigie Bridge

The MDC Craigie Bridge, mile 1.0, across the Charles River has a vertical clearance of 5 feet at mean high water and 15 feet at mean low water in the closed position. The existing operating regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.591(e). This proposed rule would allow the bridge owner to require an eight-hour advance notice for openings midnight to 8 a.m., during April, May, October, and November.

William T. Morrissey Boulevard Bridge

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 in the closed position. The existing operating regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.597. This proposed rule would allow the bridge owner to require an eight-hour advance notice for bridge openings from midnight to 8 a.m., during April, May, and October.

General Edwards SR1A Bridge

The General Edwards SR1A Bridge, at mile 1.7, across the Saugus River has a vertical clearance of 27 feet at mean high water and 36 feet at mean low water in the closed position. The existing operating regulations listed at 33 CFR 117.618(b). This proposed rule would allow the bridge owner to require an eight-hour advance notice for bridge openings from midnight to 8 a.m., April through November.

The Coast Guard believes this rule is reasonable because all three bridges historically receive very few requests, if any, to open during the time periods they will require an eight-hour advance notice for bridge openings.

Discussion of Proposal

This proposed change would amend 33 CFR 117.591, which governs operation of the Metropolitan District Commission Craigie Bridge, by adding a new paragraph paragraph (e)(3) to require an eight-hour advance notice for bridge openings from midnight to 8 a.m., April, May, October, and November.

This proposed change would revise 33 CFR 117.597, which governs the operation of the William T. Morrissey Boulevard Bridge, by adding the requirement for an eight-hour advance notice from midnight to 8 a.m., for April, May, and October.

This proposed change would also amend 33 CFR 117.618, which governs the operation of the General Edwards

SR1A Bridge, by revising paragraph (b) to add the requirement for an eight-hour advance notice for bridge openings midnight to 8 a.m., April through November, and from 4 p.m. to 8 a.m. from December through March.

The language in the existing regulation regarding bridge openings for public vessels of the United States, state and local vessels used for public safety will be removed. That requirement is now listed under 33 CFR 117.31.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed 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 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.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation, under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS, is unnecessary.

This conclusion is based on the fact that the bridges normally receive few requests to open during the times the advance notice will be required.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we 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 section 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 conclusion is based on the fact that the normally receive few requests to open during times the advance notice will be required.

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 proposed rule would call 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 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 or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under E.O. 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 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 would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes,