

safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed 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, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a "tribal implication" under the Order.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed 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. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (*e.g.*, specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National

Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation because this rulemaking is a security zone less than one week in duration. A draft "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a draft "Categorical Exclusion Determination" (CED) are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether the rule should be categorically excluded from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Add § 165.507 to read as follows:

§ 165.507 Security Zone; Georgetown Channel, Potomac River, Washington, DC.

(a) *Definitions.* For purposes of this section, *Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland* means the Commander, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Maryland or any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer who has been authorized by the Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland to act on his or her behalf.

(b) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: All waters of Georgetown Channel of the Potomac River, from surface to bottom, between the Long Railroad Bridge (the most eastern bridge of the 5-span, Fourteenth Street Bridge complex) to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge and all waters in between, including the waters of the Georgetown Channel Tidal Basin.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) The general regulations governing security zones, found in § 165.33 of this part, apply to the security zone described in paragraph (b) of this section.

(2) Entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland.

(3) Persons or vessels seeking entry into or passage through the security zone described in paragraph (b) of this section must first request authorization from the Captain of the Port, Baltimore to seek permission to transit the area. The Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland can be contacted at telephone number (410) 576–2693. The Coast Guard vessels enforcing this section can be contacted on VHF Marine Band Radio, VHF channel 16 (156.8 MHz). Upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel must proceed as directed. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland and proceed at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course while within the zone.

(d) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the zone by Federal, State, and local agencies.

(e) *Effective period.* This section will be effective from 12:01 a.m. to 11:59 p.m. local time on July 4, 2005.

Dated: April 25, 2005.

Curtis A. Springer,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland.

[FR Doc. 05–9077 Filed 5–5–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Charleston 05–037]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zones; Charleston Harbor, Cooper River, SC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes a permanent fixed security zone in the waters from the Don Holt, I–526 Bridge, on the Cooper River to the entrance of Foster Creek on the Cooper River, South Carolina. This security zone is necessary to protect the public and port from potential subversive acts during port embarkation operations. During enforcement of the security zone vessels would be prohibited from entering, transiting, anchoring, mooring, or

loitering within this zone, unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Charleston, South Carolina, or the Captain of the Port's designated representative.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before May 26, 2005.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Marine Safety Office Charleston, 196 Tradd St., Charleston, SC 29401. Marine Safety Office Charleston maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at Marine Safety Office Charleston between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG Matthew Meskun, Chief of Waterways Management Division at 843-720-3240.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (COTP Charleston 05-037), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know that your submission reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Marine Safety Office Charleston at the address 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

This security zone is necessary to protect the safety of life and property on navigable waters and prevents potential terrorist threats aimed at military

installations during strategic embarkation operations. The security zone would encompass all waters on the Cooper River, South Carolina, from the Don Holt I-526 Bridge to the entrance of Foster Creek. Two or more military vessels may be in port at the same time, and each of these vessels requires security zones. When this situation occurs, the security zone described above would be enforced and would ensure greater vessel security than enforcing individual security zones. Additionally, this proposed security zone has been in place on a temporary basis since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The current temporary security zone, 33 CFR 165.T07-145, was published in the **Federal Register** January 6, 2005 (70 FR 1187).

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The proposed security zone would encompass all waters on the Cooper River, South Carolina, from the Don Holt I-526 Bridge to the entrance of Foster Creek. The Charleston Captain of the Port would enforce the security zone on the Cooper River from time to time and in the interest of national security vessels that are carrying cargo for the Department of Defense.

These vessels that carry DoD cargo need a level of security that requires the Cooper River to be closed to all traffic for a short period of time. Security assets would be on scene and mariners would be given as much advanced notice as possible. Marine Safety Office Charleston would notify the maritime community of closure periods via a broadcast notice to mariners on VHF Marine Band Radio, Channel 16 (156.8 MHz), or Marine Safety Information Bulletins, or actual notice from on scene security assets enforcing the zone.

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.

The limited geographic area encompassed by the security zone

should not restrict the movement of commercial or recreational vessels through the Port of Charleston. Also, the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or the Captain of the Port's designated representative may allow an individual to transit the security zone subsequent to an individual's request.

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 a portion of the Cooper River while the security zone is in effect.

This security zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it would only be in place for short periods of time on an infrequent basis. Advanced notice would be provided to mariners so they can adjust their schedules due to enforcement of the security zone.

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.

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 proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact LTJG Mathew Meskun at Marine Safety Office Charleston at 843-720-3240. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain

about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

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 affect 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 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 might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed 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, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed 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. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation due to its limited duration in a fixed area.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g) of the Instruction, an “Environmental

Analysis Check List” and a “Categorical Exclusion Determination” are not required for this rule. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether to categorically exclude this rule from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Add § 165.709 to read as follows:

§ 165.709 Security Zone; Charleston Harbor, Cooper River, South Carolina.

(a) *Regulated area.* The Coast Guard is establishing a fixed security zone on all waters of the Cooper River, bank-to-bank and surface to bottom, from the Don Holt I–526 Bridge to the intersection of Foster Creek at a line on 32 degrees 58 minutes North Latitude.

(b) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced when security assets are on scene and Marine Safety Office Charleston has notified the maritime community that an Enforcement Period is in effect. Marine Safety Office Charleston will notify the maritime community by broadcast notice to mariners on VHF Marine Band Radio, Channel 16 (156.8 MHz), or Marine Safety Information Bulletins, or actual notice from on scene security assets enforcing the security zone.

(c) *Regulations.* During enforcement of the security zone described in paragraph (a) of this section, vessels or persons are prohibited from entering, transiting, mooring, anchoring, or loitering within the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Charleston, South Carolina or his or her designated representative.

(1) Persons desiring to transit the Regulated Area may contact the Captain of the Port via VHF–FM channel 16 or by telephone at (843) 720–3240 and request permission to transit the security zone.

(2) If permission to transit the security zone is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of

the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

Dated: April 15, 2005.

John E. Cameron,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Charleston, South Carolina.

[FR Doc. 05–9036 Filed 5–5–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

49 CFR Subtitle A

[Docket No. OST–2005–20434]

Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee on Minimum Standards for Driver's Licenses and Personal Identification Cards

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary (OST), DOT.

ACTION: Suspension of advisory committee meeting.

SUMMARY: This document suspends the meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee on Minimum Standards for Driver's Licenses and Personal Identification Cards scheduled for May 10–13, 2005. The reason for the action is impending Congressional action, in the near future, concerning the "REAL ID Act." This legislation would repeal section 7212 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which provides the authority for the negotiated rulemaking on this subject.

DATES: The May 10–13, 2005, meeting of the advisory committee is suspended immediately.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert C. Ashby, Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulation and Enforcement, Office of the General Counsel, at (202) 366–9310 (bob.ashby@dot.gov); Department of Transportation, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, room 10424.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 17, 2004, the President signed into law the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. (Pub. L. 108–458). Title VII of that Act is known as the 9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004 (the 9/11 Act). Subtitle B of the 9/11 Act addresses terrorist travel and effective screening. Among other things, Subtitle B, section 7212, mandated the issuance of minimum standards for State-issued driver's licenses and personal identification cards (Section 7212) that will be accepted by Federal agencies for official purposes.

Section 7212 directed the Department of Transportation to issue rules with the assistance of a negotiated rulemaking advisory committee, composed of representatives of the Departments of Transportation and Homeland Security, State agencies that issue driver's licenses, State elected officials, and other interested parties. The Department formed such an advisory committee, which met on April 19–21, 2005.

Congress has nearly completed work needed to pass the "REAL ID Act," (a part of S. 1268), which repeals section 7212. As provided in the charter for the advisory committee, the committee—and the negotiated rulemaking process of which it is a key part—will terminate upon enactment of legislation repealing section 7212. Because we anticipate that the REAL ID Act will become law in the very near future, we are reluctant to ask committee members to commit the time and effort to the advisory committee next week, so the Department in this notice announces the suspension of the meeting of the committee that had been scheduled for May 10–13, 2005. If Congress enacts the REAL ID Act, the Department will issue another **Federal Register** notice, which will formally terminate the advisory committee and the regulatory negotiation process.

Issued this 4th day of May, 2005, in Washington, DC.

Jeffrey A. Rosen,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 05–9200 Filed 5–4–05; 2:05 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA 2005–20791]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition for rulemaking submitted by the Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association (FEMA) to require all new light duty trucks to be equipped with fire extinguishers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For legal issues: Mr. George Feygin, Office of the Chief Counsel, phone (202) 366–2992. For technical issues: Mr. Charles R. Hott, Office of Crashworthiness

Standards, NVS–113, phone (202) 366–0247.

You can reach both of these officials at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 14, 2004, NHTSA received a petition from FEMA to require all new light duty trucks¹ to be equipped with fire extinguishers.² FEMA is an international group of leading fire protection manufacturers working together to educate the public about fire prevention to save lives and reduce property damage. Member companies manufacture fire protection products.

FEMA stated that the safety benefits of fire extinguishers in all new light trucks justify rulemaking to require the installation of portable fire extinguishers. FEMA also stated that fires are a common occurrence on America's highways and in automobile crashes. FEMA noted that according to the *Traffic Safety Facts 2001*, there were 14,000 automobile accidents where fire was involved, representing 0.1 percent of all vehicles involved in traffic crashes. Of those 14,000 accidents, 1,657 proved to be fatal and 5,000 involved injury. FEMA further stated that automobile crashes involving fires are more deadly. FEMA also provided data showing that crash related fires represent two percent of the total vehicle fires in the United States. FEMA enclosed a report from the National Fire Protection Association³ showing that there were 307,000 fires in all motor vehicles in 2002.

FEMA contends that requiring fire extinguishers in new light trucks can help slow down the spread of fires because all fires start small, and it is crucial to keep the fire at bay long enough to rescue any occupants in order to prevent loss of life or injury. FEMA stated that swift use of portable fire extinguishers is likely to prevent small fires from becoming more significant and dangerous, and that this will provide rescuers with additional time to save occupants. FEMA further contends that increasing the number of fire extinguishers on roads increases the chance that vehicles passing an automobile fire can help rescue occupants. FEMA stated that fire

¹ The United States Department of Transportation, *Traffic Safety Facts 2003* defines "light duty trucks" as "trucks of 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight rating or less, including pickups, vans, truck-based station wagons, and utility vehicles."

² See Docket No. NHTSA–2004–16856–44.

³ Fire Loss in the United States During 2002, National Fire Protection Association, September 2003.