

Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 3, 2017, and effective September 15, 2017. FAA Order 7400.11B is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. FAA Order 7400.11B lists Class A, B, C, D, and E airspace areas, air traffic service routes, and reporting points.

### The Proposal

The FAA is proposing an amendment to Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 by modifying Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface at Lyons-Rice County Municipal Airport, Lyons, KS, and the geographic coordinates to coincide with the FAA's aeronautical database.

Airspace reconfiguration is necessary due to the decommissioning and cancellation of the Lyons NDB, and NDB approach, which would enhance the safety and management of the standard instrument approach procedures for IFR operations at the airport.

Class E airspace designations are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.11B, dated August 3, 2017, and effective September 15, 2017, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

### Regulatory Notices and Analyses

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current, is non-controversial and unlikely to result in adverse or negative comments. It, therefore: (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

### Environmental Review

This proposal will be subject to an environmental analysis in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, "Environmental Impacts: Policies and

Procedures" prior to any FAA final regulatory action.

### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

### The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

### PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

- 1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

#### § 71.1 [Amended]

- 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of FAA Order 7400.11B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 3, 2017, and effective September 15, 2017, is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace Areas Extending Upward From 700 Feet or More Above the Surface of the Earth.*

\* \* \* \* \*

#### ACE KS E5 Lyons, KS [Amended]

Lyons-Rice County Municipal Airport, KS (Lat. 38°20'31" N, long. 98°13'38" W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.5-mile radius of Lyons-Rice County Municipal Airport.

Issued in Fort Worth, TX, on April 5, 2018.

**Christopher L. Southerland,**

*Acting Manager, Operations Support Group, ATO Central Service Center.*

[FR Doc. 2018–07664 Filed 4–13–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

#### 23 CFR Part 790

[Docket No. FHWA–2013–0018]

RIN 2125–AF63

#### Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA withdraws its August 4, 2014, Notice of Proposed

Rulemaking (NPRM), which proposed to establish a weighting factor of 5.0, to be used in determining the weighted population of fine particulate (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) nonattainment areas.

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21) language for the CMAQ Program funds that must be obligated for PM<sub>2.5</sub> projects in PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment and maintenance areas (referred to in this document as a "set-aside") instructs that the set-aside be calculated based on "weighted population" in PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas. Because the statute did not specify the values to be applied to determine the weighted population, FHWA had previously initiated a rulemaking to establish the weighting factor. After reviewing the record in this matter, FHWA withdraws the NPRM.

**DATES:** The NPRM "Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program," RIN 2125–2013–0018, published August 4, 2014 (79 FR 45146), is withdrawn as of April 16, 2018.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Cecilia Ho, Office of Natural Environment, 202–366–9862, or Ms. Diane Mobley, Office of the Chief Counsel, 202–366–1366, Federal Highway Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE, Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Electronic Access and Filing

This document, the 2014 NPRM, and all comments received may be viewed online through the Federal eRulemaking portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. The website is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. An electronic copy of this document may also be downloaded by accessing the Office of the Federal Register's home page at <https://www.federalregister.gov>.

#### Background

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Pub. L. 102–240, 105 Stat. 1914) established the CMAQ Program. The program provides funding to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*). Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), or particulate matter (*i.e.*, nonattainment areas), and for areas that were out of compliance but have

now met the standards (*i.e.*, maintenance areas). The program was reauthorized under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105–178, 112 Stat. 107) in 1998, under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) (Pub. L. 109–59, 119 Stat. 1144) in 2005, under MAP–21 (Pub. L. 112–141, 126 Stat. 405) in 2012, and most recently under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Pub. L. 114–94, 129 Stat. 1312) in 2015.

Section 1113(b)(6) of MAP–21 amended 23 U.S.C. 149 by adding subsection (k)(1) requiring priority use of CMAQ funds in areas that are designated nonattainment or maintenance for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, 23 U.S.C. 149(k)(1) states:

For any State that has a nonattainment or maintenance area for fine particulate matter, an amount equal to 25 percent of the funds apportioned to each State under section 104(b)(4) for a nonattainment or maintenance area that are based all or in part on the weighted population of such area in fine particulate matter nonattainment shall be obligated to projects that reduce such fine particulate matter emissions in such area, including diesel retrofits.

Although the statute requires that the PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside must be calculated based on “weighted population,” it was not specific regarding what that weighting factor should be. Because the language did not specify values to be applied to determine the weighted population, FHWA must make that determination as the Agency implementing the CMAQ Program.

Since October 1, 2012, a State’s CMAQ apportionment has been determined by multiplying a State’s total amount for all apportioned programs under MAP–21 by the share of the State’s total Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 apportionments for the CMAQ Program apportionment relative to the State’s total apportionments under all programs for FY 2009, based on the statutory formula at the time.<sup>2</sup>

For the PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside calculation, FHWA follows the prior statutory approach to weighted population formulas. To determine the 25 percent that States must set-aside for PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment and maintenance areas, FHWA must determine weighted populations for ozone, CO, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment and maintenance areas. The weighted population numbers provide a means to reflect the severity of the air quality problems among the

populations of the areas in nonattainment and maintenance for ozone, CO, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The FHWA is using the weighting factors in the most recent statutory apportionment formula from SAFETEA–LU for ozone and CO. However, since MAP–21 and prior legislation did not include a PM<sub>2.5</sub> weighting factor in CMAQ apportionment formulas, FHWA continues to use the weighted population formula, which was used in prior statutes, to determine the PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside under MAP–21.

The use of the previous weighted population formula for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside calculation is based on the congressional description of the set-aside and requires two main mathematical steps, with multiple sub-steps. The PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside calculation is based on the State’s net CMAQ apportionment, which is the State’s total CMAQ apportionment minus required set-asides for the Transportation Alternatives Program and State Planning & Research. The first main step is to determine the amount of the State’s net CMAQ apportionment that is attributable to PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment and maintenance. County-level weighted populations are calculated by taking the population in each of the State’s counties with a nonattainment or maintenance area and multiplying by the weighting factors for each pollutant for which the county is in nonattainment or maintenance status. The State’s total weighted population for all three criteria pollutants (ozone, CO, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) is determined by combining the weighted populations of all counties in nonattainment or maintenance for any of the pollutants. The State’s PM<sub>2.5</sub> weighted population is determined by combining the weighted populations of all counties in nonattainment or maintenance for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The State’s PM<sub>2.5</sub> weighted population is divided by the State’s total weighted population to determine the percentage of the State’s total weighted population attributable all or in part to PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The net CMAQ apportionment amount then is multiplied by the PM<sub>2.5</sub> percentage to determine the amount of the net CMAQ apportionment amount attributable to PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollutants. The second main step is to multiply the resulting number by 25 percent to arrive at the PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside under 23 U.S.C. 149(k)(1). States are to spend that set-aside only on PM<sub>2.5</sub> projects, as chosen by the States, in the nonattainment or maintenance areas for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. This is not meant to be a limit on the amount of funds to be spent; areas may spend

additional CMAQ funds above the 25 percent set-aside on PM<sub>2.5</sub> projects.

To calculate the weighted population of an area under 23 U.S.C. 149(k)(1), FHWA uses updated populations based on the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau for each county, or part of a county, that is designated nonattainment or maintenance for ozone, CO, or PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The U.S. Census Bureau provides annual estimates of county populations, and FHWA historically has used this jurisdictional level to determine CMAQ apportionments. Updated populations are then given a relative value—a weighting—that corresponds to the nonattainment designation and severity of the criteria pollutant classification of the area, as established under the CAA.

Beginning in 2013, FHWA implemented the MAP–21 changes by an administrative determination to use a weighting factor of 1.2 for PM<sub>2.5</sub> areas. The justification for this determination was outlined in the August 2014 NPRM.

The FHWA issued a NPRM on August 4, 2014, proposing to set a weighting factor of 5.0 for PM<sub>2.5</sub> areas. The FHWA solicited comments on this weighting factor and specifically requested comments on whether setting the weighting factor at 5.0 may present any implementation concerns for States or local transportation agencies, and if so, how FHWA could address those concerns. The FHWA received 28<sup>3</sup> sets of comments on the NPRM.

#### NPRM Comments Generally

One State DOT commented that a weighting factor of 5.0 does not fully consider the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) analysis for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. The EPA’s analysis predicted that the implementation of Federal controls will ensure more than 90 percent of areas will attain the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS by the year 2020. The EPA expects that fewer than 10 counties, out of the more than 3,000 counties in the U.S., will need to consider any local actions to reduce fine particle pollution in order to meet the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS by 2020. The rest of the country can rely on air quality improvements from Federal rules already on the books to meet this new standard. It is not clear to the commenter that a proposed weighting factor of 5.0 sufficiently considered this EPA information and the associated reduction in potentially harmful health impacts.

One metropolitan planning organization (MPO) commented that setting the weighting factor at 5.0 could

<sup>1</sup> The EPA has set both an annual and a 24-hour NAAQS for PM<sub>2.5</sub> (40 CFR 50.7).

<sup>2</sup> 23 U.S.C. 104(b)(4).

<sup>3</sup> The docket shows receipt of 31 comments; however, 3 sets were duplicates.

inhibit the region's ability to meet existing reduction commitments for ground-level ozone and place a fast-growing region at a disadvantage for dealing with increased congestion. A weighting factor of 5.0 does not take into account resources available at the State and local level. The commenter is concerned that increasing the PM<sub>2.5</sub> weighting factor from the interim value of 1.2 to 5.0 will significantly reduce the flexibility of a State or region to develop air quality projects that best meet the needs of the affected local population.

One State DOT disagreed with FHWA's characterization of the impact of moving from a weighting factor of 1.2 to a weighting factor of 5.0 as producing a "modest difference." The commenter pointed out that the amount of the set-aside shown in an example set forth in the NPRM<sup>4</sup> increases by more than 15 percent. If the weighting factor were to be increased from the current 1.2 to the proposed 5.0, the amount required to be set-aside for the 7 counties in Michigan would increase from \$11.5 million to \$15.6 million, an increase of more than \$4.1 million per year, or roughly 36 percent. Every dollar and the strings attached to each dollar, matter greatly to the State.

The comments submitted by a transportation association and supported by 10 State DOTs and other transportation organizations recommended that the final rule provide the specific weightings to be used for each possible combination of nonattainment and maintenance areas. They commented that the following combinations were not addressed in the proposed rule, and should be added to the final rule: (1) Ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas that are also designated as PM<sub>2.5</sub> maintenance areas; (2) CO nonattainment or maintenance areas that are also designated as PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas; (3) CO nonattainment or maintenance areas that are also designated as PM<sub>2.5</sub> maintenance areas; (4) Ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas that are also designated as CO nonattainment or maintenance areas and are designated as PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas; and (5) Ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas that are also designated as CO nonattainment or maintenance areas and are designated as PM<sub>2.5</sub> maintenance areas. These combinations should be addressed specifically in the final rule even if the weighting for one or more of the individual pollutants (e.g., CO) is 1.0. The benefit of specifying the weighting factor for each possible combination is that it ensures

clarity and certainty in implementation of the rule.

The same transportation association with the supporting State DOTs also expressed their opposition to the proposed 5.0 weighting. They believed that the reasoning presented for selecting the weighting factor of 5.0 is inadequately supported in the proposed rulemaking. They commented that increasing the PM<sub>2.5</sub> weighting factor from 1.2 to 5.0 will significantly reduce the flexibility of a State or region to develop air quality projects that best meet the needs of the affected local population. They recommended retaining the existing weighting of 1.2 for the following reasons: (1) The earlier Senate version of MAP-21 included a 1.2 weighting factor for an apportionment formula for areas designated nonattainment or maintenance for PM<sub>2.5</sub>; (2) The weighting factors used prior to MAP-21 (to determine CMAQ apportionments) ranged from 1.0 for CO to 1.4 for the highest ozone classification—as the NPRM notes, a weighting factor of 1.2 is in the midpoint value of that range, and a reasonable inference is that Congress intended for FHWA to adopt a weighting factor within the range of those already in use; and (3) The factor only establishes a minimum investment level for PM<sub>2.5</sub> projects. A State can invest additional funding in such projects if it determines this is the best use of its CMAQ funding. They do not believe there is sufficient support for concluding that PM<sub>2.5</sub> should be assigned a weighting factor that is twice as great as the other two pollutants combined. Such a factor has no basis in the legislation nor does the scientific information cited in the NPRM provide a compelling basis for assigning such a weighting. They further commented that even if FHWA concluded that the highest existing factor should be doubled, there is an error in the logic proposed in this NPRM. The highest possible weighting factor should be 1.2 multiplied by 1.4, or 1.68 for an area that is nonattainment or maintenance for CO and is also extreme nonattainment for ozone. Thus, if the intent is to double the highest possible weighting factor under current law and policy, the weighting factor should be no higher than 3.36.

In the event that a weighting factor of 1.2 is not retained for PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas, the commenters recommended adopting a weighting factor no higher than the current highest weighting factor of 1.4 for "extreme" ozone nonattainment areas. This approach would ensure that the weighting for PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas

is within the range contemplated by Congress when it enacted MAP-21 while also reflecting the heightened severity of PM<sub>2.5</sub> health effects.

Five commenters (two State DOTs and three MPOs) support FHWA setting the PM<sub>2.5</sub> weighting factor at 5.0. These commenters cited the serious health impacts associated with PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. They agreed that setting the weighting factor at 5.0 for PM<sub>2.5</sub> set-aside calculations was intended to improve and benefit overall public health by targeting PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. The commenters also agreed that it is reasonable to set a weighting factor for PM<sub>2.5</sub> that is higher than the weighting factor for ozone and CO given the potential health impacts.

One commenter suggests that an even higher weighting factor (higher than 5.0) for PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas could be supported if cost effectiveness of CMAQ projects were taken into account. For example, the Carl Moyer Program administered by the California Air Resources Board has, for many years, taken the health impacts and toxicity of PM<sub>2.5</sub> into account in its cost effectiveness formula that is used to determine which projects are funded. They urged FHWA to consider the rationale for a higher weighting of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission reductions relative to nitrogen oxide, volatile organic compounds, and CO, as well.

One MPO commented that a wide variety of projects eligible under the CMAQ Program reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> as well as other criteria pollutants. The flexibility that FHWA has provided to select projects that demonstrate criteria pollutant emissions for CMAQ funding is beneficial and appreciated. This commenter requests that FHWA continue this flexibility with respect to the types of projects that reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> and are counted toward the obligation targets for such projects. This allows each region to effectively target investment opportunities specific to its unique strategies to meet air quality as well as other planning objectives.

#### **FHWA Decision To Withdraw the NPRM**

Based on the current record, including comments received in response to the NPRM indicating that the 1.2 weighting factor was sufficient and provided States necessary flexibilities, FHWA has decided to withdraw the August 2014 NPRM and, accordingly, cancels the plans to develop a final rule. If FHWA determines changes to the weighting factor currently in use are necessary and advisable in the future, a new rulemaking would be initiated that will

incorporate any appropriate recommendations from the comments received through this rulemaking. The FHWA will continue to use the weighting factor in use since 2013. The NPRM proposing to establish a weighting factor to be used in determining the weighted population of PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas are withdrawn.

Issued on: April 10, 2018.

**Brandye L. Hendrickson,**

*Acting Administrator, Federal Highway Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2018-07906 Filed 4-13-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG-2018-0270]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety Zone; North Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone for certain waters of the North Atlantic Ocean adjacent to Ocean City, MD. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life on the navigable waters during an air show on May 23, 2018. This action would prohibit persons and vessels from entering the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Maryland-National Capital Region or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before May 16, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2018-0270 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email Mr. Ron Houck, Sector Maryland-National Capital Region Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone

410-576-2674, email [Ronald.L.Houck@uscg.mil](mailto:Ronald.L.Houck@uscg.mil).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
COTP Captain of the Port  
DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register  
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking  
§ Section  
U.S.C. United States Code

##### II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On February 21, 2018, the Town of Ocean City, MD, notified the Coast Guard that it will be conducting the Canadian Snowbirds Air Show Featurette from 2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on May 23, 2018. Details of the event were provided to the Coast Guard on March 7, 2018. The air show consists of a single public performance by the Canadian Forces 431 Air Demonstration Squadron conducting a 40-minute aerobatic performance of high-speed, low-flying fixed-wing military aircraft operating within a Federal Aviation Administration-designated air show box, located above the North Atlantic Ocean adjacent to Ocean City, MD. Hazards from the air show include participants operating adjacent to a designated navigation channel and interfering with vessels intending to operate within that channel, as well as aircraft mishaps that involve crashing during an air show aerobatic performance conducted above navigable waters located near the shoreline. The COTP Maryland-National Capital Region has determined that potential hazards associated with the air show would be a safety concern for anyone intending to operate within certain waters of the North Atlantic Ocean adjacent to Ocean City, MD.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of persons and vessels on certain waters of the North Atlantic Ocean before, during, and after the scheduled event. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231.

##### III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP proposes to establish a safety zone from 1:30 p.m. to 4 p.m. on May 23, 2018. The safety zone would cover all waters of the North Atlantic Ocean, within an area bounded by the following coordinates: Commencing at a point near the shoreline at latitude 38°20'33.3" N, longitude 075°04'37.7" W, thence eastward to latitude 38°20'24.9" N, longitude 075°04'01.5" W, thence southward to latitude

38°19'18.4" N, longitude 075°04'26.9" W, thence westward to latitude 38°19'27.0" N, longitude 075°05'03.0" W, thence northward to point of origin, located adjacent to Ocean City, MD. The safety zone will encompass all navigable waters within a rectangular area approximately 7,000 feet in length and 3,000 feet in width, parallel to the shoreline at Ocean City, MD. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the safety of persons and vessels on the specified navigable waters before, during, and after the scheduled 2 p.m. air show. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

##### IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

###### A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Executive Order 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. This NPRM has not been designated a "significant regulatory action," under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and day-of-week of the safety zone. Vessel traffic will be able to safely transit around this safety zone, which would impact a small designated area of the North Atlantic Ocean for less than 3 hours during a Wednesday before Memorial Day when vessel traffic is normally low. The Coast Guard will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF-FM marine band channel 16 to provide information about the safety zone.

###### B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The