

TABLE B.—DISTRICT 2—RATE MULTIPLIER
[Revenue Needed ÷ Projected Revenue = Rate Multiplier]

Area 4	\$854,237 ÷ \$705,015	1.21
Area 5	\$1,392,460 ÷ \$1,461,069	0.95
Total	\$2,246,697 ÷ \$2,166,084	1.04

TABLE C.—DISTRICT 3—RATE MULTIPLIER
[Revenue Needed ÷ Projected Revenue = Rate Multiplier]

Area 6	\$1,847,087 ÷ \$1,540,306	1.20
Area 7	\$923,950 ÷ \$1,119,819	0.83
Area 8	\$1,230,164 ÷ \$1,030,693	1.19
Total	\$4,001,202 ÷ \$3,690,818	1.08

TOTAL ACROSS ALL DISTRICTS—RATE MULTIPLIER
[Revenue Needed ÷ Projected Revenue = Rate Multiplier]

All Districts	\$7,992,450 ÷ \$7,591,284	1.05
---------------------	---------------------------	------

(2) The Coast Guard amends the pilotage rates for the waters treated in 46 CFR 401.405 through 46 CFR 401.410 by multiplying the current pilotage rates by the rate multiplier for each pilotage area. The following table shows the percentage changes in rates by Area.

If you require pilotage service in:	The rate will:
Area 1 (Designated waters).	Increase by 4%.
Area 2	Decrease by 5%.
Area 4	Increase by 21%.
Area 5 (Designated waters).	Decrease by 5%.
Area 6	Increase by 20%.
Area 7 (Designated waters).	Decrease by 17%.
Area 8	Increase by 19%.

The total change across all Districts is 5 percent.

Part 3: Differences Between This Interim Rulemaking Regulation and the NPRM Published in January 2003

(1) Pending an opportunity to finish reviewing certain comments that were received in connection with the NPRM published in the **Federal Register** on January 23, 2003 (68 FR 3202), the Coast Guard has concluded that while many of these comments raised important points to be further explored, it was also equally important to establish at least a partial rate adjustment pending that review. We adopted a number of suggestions raised by comments, which has had the effect of reducing the rates proposed in the NPRM.

(2) Calculations to determine pilot target compensation for undesignated and designated waters of the Great Lakes differs from the calculations published in the NPRM (68 FR 3202).

Comments received in response to the NPRM stated that the Coast Guard should credit only 5 days a month as vacations days vice 15 days to determine pilots' target compensation. The Coast Guard, in previous rulemakings, has included 15 days a month in its calculation of pilots' target compensation. For purposes of this interim rule, the Coast Guard has used the figures of those favoring a 44-day multiplier over a 54-day multiplier. This change has decreased the rate proposed in the NPRM. The Coast Guard continues to review this issue and expects to make a determination before calculating the full rate adjustment for the supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNPRM).

(3) Many comments suggested that the needs of pilotage on the Great Lakes could be met with fewer than the total number of pilots recommended in the NPRM. This season's decline in shipping indicates that for the near term the rounding up of pilotage numbers, which is frequently performed in the course of determining the number of pilots needed, is not necessary, pending a full economic review of the Great Lakes basin. This, too, has resulted in a reduction to rates proposed in the NPRM.

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.

There are no small entities that will be directly affected by this interim rule. The businesses directly affected will be owners and operators of vessels who generally are large companies or are affiliated with large companies. Indirectly affected entities, such as shippers of major commodities like steel, iron ore, and grain will be affected only to the extent that these changes cause owners and operators of vessels to adjust shipping charges.

Therefore, 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. If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule will have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**. In your comment, explain why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule will economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this 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 call Paul Wasserman, Director, Office of Great Lakes Pilotage, (G-MWP–1), Coast Guard, telephone (202) 267–2856 or