

after its publication in the **Federal Register**.

#### Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the address listed under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one 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**.

#### Background and Purpose

On November 8, 2003, the City of Annapolis will sponsor the "International Tug-of-War" across the waters of Spa Creek between Eastport and Annapolis, Maryland. The event will consist of a tug-of-war between teams on the Eastport side of Spa Creek pulling against teams on the Annapolis side of Spa Creek. The opposing teams will pull a floating rope approximately 1800 feet in length, spanning Spa Creek. A fleet of spectator vessels is anticipated. Due to the need for vessel control while the rope is spanned across Spa Creek, vessel traffic would be temporarily restricted to provide for the safety of spectators, participants and transiting vessels.

#### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish temporary special local regulations on specified waters of Spa Creek. The regulated area would include a 400' buffer on either side of the rope that would span Spa Creek from shoreline to shoreline. The temporary special local regulations would be enforced from 10:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on November 8, 2003, and would restrict general navigation in the regulated area during the event. Except for participants and vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area. The Coast Guard Patrol Commander may stop the event to allow vessels to transit the regulated area.

#### 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 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).

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. Although this proposed regulation would prevent traffic from transiting a portion of Spa Creek during the event, the effect of this proposed regulation would not be significant due to the limited duration that the regulated area would be in effect and the extensive advance notifications that would be made to the maritime community via the Local Notice to Mariners, marine information broadcasts, and area newspapers, so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly. Additionally, the proposed regulated area has been narrowly tailored to impose the least impact on general navigation yet provide the level of safety deemed necessary. Vessel traffic would be able to transit the regulated area when the Coast Guard Patrol Commander deems it is safe to do so.

#### 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 would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of Spa Creek during the event.

This proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This proposed rule would be in effect for only a 4-hour period. Vessel traffic would be able to transit the regulated area when the Coast Guard Patrol Commander deems it is safe to do so. Before the enforcement period, we would issue maritime advisories so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed 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 proposed rule would economically affect it.

#### 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 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 the address listed under **ADDRESSES**.

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

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