

Once we determined the annual risk points reduced, we discounted these estimates to their PV (7 percent discount rate, 2003–2012) so that they could be compared to the costs. We presented the

cost effectiveness, or dollars per risk point reduced, in two ways: First, we compared first-year cost to first-year benefit, because first-year cost is the highest in our assessment as companies

develop security plans and purchase equipment. Second, we compared the 10-year PV cost to the 10-year PV benefit. The results of our assessment are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8.—FIRST-YEAR AND 10-YEAR PV COST AND BENEFIT OF THE INTERIM RULES

Item	Interim rule				
	Vessel security plans	Facility security plans	OCS facility security plans	AMS plans	AIS <sup>1</sup>
First-Year Cost (millions) .....	\$218	\$1,125	\$3	\$120	\$41
First-Year Benefit .....	781,285	473,659	13,288	135,202	1,553
First-Year Cost Effectiveness (\$/Risk Point Reduced) .....	\$279	\$2,375	\$205	\$890	\$26,391
10-Year PV Cost (millions) .....	\$1,368	\$5,399	\$37	\$477	\$42
10-Year PV Benefit .....	5,871,540	3,559,655	99,863	1,016,074	11,671
10-Year PV Cost Effectiveness (\$/Risk Point Reduced) .....	\$233	\$1,517	\$368	\$469	\$3,624

<sup>1</sup> Cost less monetized safety benefit.

As shown, the rulemaking for vessel security plans is the most cost effective. This is due to the nature of the security measures we expect vessels will have to take to ensure compliance as well as the level of risk that is reduced by those measures. Facility security plans are less cost effective because they incur higher costs for capital purchases (such as gates and fences) and require more labor (such as security guards) to ensure security. OCS Facility and AMS Plans are almost equally cost effective; the entities these rules cover do not incur the highest expenses for capital equipment, but on this relative scale, they do not receive higher risk reduction in the N–RAT, either. The AIS rulemaking is the least cost effective, though it is important to remember that AIS provides increased maritime domain awareness and navigation safety, which is not robustly captured using the N–RAT.

#### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether these interim rules 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. These interim rules do not require a general notice of proposed rulemaking and, therefore, are exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Although these interim rules are exempt, we have reviewed each rule for potential economic impacts on small entities. We found that the facilities, vessels, and AIS rules may have a

significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. However, we did certify no significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the Area Maritime Security and OCS facility security rules. Additional information on small entity impacts is available in the *Regulatory Assessment* or *Cost Assessment* for each interim rule in their associated docket, where indicated in the **ADDRESSES** section for each interim rule.

#### Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding these rules so that they can better evaluate the effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If these rules affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning their provisions or options for compliance, please consult CDR Suzanne Englebert, G–M–1 by telephone 202–267–1103, toll-free telephone 1–800–842–8740 ext. 7–1103, or by electronic mail [msregs@comdt.uscg.mil](mailto:msregs@comdt.uscg.mil).

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

#### Collection of Information

The interim rules published in today’s **Federal Register** contain collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). As defined in 5 CFR 1320.3(c), “collection of information” comprises reporting, recordkeeping, monitoring, posting, labeling, and other, similar actions. The rules modify two existing OMB-approved collections—1625–0100 [formerly 2115–0557] and 1625–0077 [formerly 2115–0622]. Details of the revision to 1625–0100 can be found in the “Vessel Security” [USCG–2003–14749] interim rule published elsewhere in today’s **Federal Register**. A summary of the revised collection 1625–0077 follows.

**TITLE:** Security Plans for Ports, Vessels, Facilities, and Outer Continental Shelf Facilities and Other Security-Related Requirements.

**OMB Control Number:** 1625–0077.

**Summary of the Collection of Information:** The Coast Guard requires security plans and communication procedures for U.S. ports and maritime areas as detailed in the interim rules. These rules provide a framework to ensure adequate security planning, drilling, and communication procedures for Ports, Vessels, Facilities, and OCS Facilities.

**Need for Information:** The primary need for information would be to determine if stakeholders are in compliance with security standards.

**Proposed Use of Information:** This information can help to determine appropriate security measures for the affected population. This information also can help determine, in the case of a transportation security incident, whether failure to meet these regulations contributed to the transportation security incident.