Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminates ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this 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 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, on or the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this 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 rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and 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 this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:


2. From September 4, 2010, to October 5, 2012, in § 117.1007, suspend paragraphs (b) and (c) and add new paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 117.1007 Elizabeth River—Eastern Branch.

* * * * *

(d) The draw of the Berkley Bridge, mile 0.4, at Norfolk, shall operate as follows:

(1) The draw shall remain closed one hour prior to the published start of a scheduled marine event regulated under Sec. 100.501, and shall remain closed until one hour following the completion of the event unless the Patrol Commander designated under Sec. 100.501 allows the bridge to open for commercial vessel traffic.

(2) The draw shall open on signal at any time for vessels carrying, in bulk, cargoes regulated by 46 CFR subchapters D or O, or Certain Dangerous Cargoes as defined in 33 CFR 160.204.

(3) For all other vessels, the draw shall open on signal at any time, except from 5 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. During these times, the draw shall:

(i) Open for commercial vessels with a draft of 18 feet or more, provided at least 6 hours notice was given to the Berkley Bridge Traffic Control room at (757) 494–2490.

(ii) Open on signal at 9 a.m., 11 a.m., 1 p.m. and 2:30 p.m.

(4) If the bridge is not opened during a particular scheduled opening per paragraph (d)(3)(ii) of this section and a vessel has made prior arrangements for a delayed opening, the draw tender may provide a single opening up to 30 minutes past that scheduled opening time for that signaling vessel, except at 2:30 p.m. The draw tender may provide a single opening up to 20 minutes past the 2:30 p.m. scheduled opening time for a signaling vessel that made prior arrangements for a delayed opening. A vessel may make prior arrangements for a delayed opening by contacting the Berkley Bridge Traffic Control room at (757) 494–2490.


William D. Lee,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,
Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2010–19518 Filed 8–5–10; 8:45 am]
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37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. RM 2008–8]

Exemption to Prohibition on Circumvention of Copyright Protection Systems for Access Control Technologies

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Final Rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Office makes a nonsubstantial correction to its regulation announcing the prohibition against circumvention of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works shall not apply to persons who engage in noninfringing uses of six classes of copyrighted works.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Kasunic, Assistant General Counsel, and David O. Carson, General Counsel, Copyright GC/IRR, P.O. Box 70400, Washington, D.C. 20024.
SUMMARY:

In this regulation, EPA again denies objections by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) to an action establishing tolerance regulations for the pesticide pymetrozine under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). EPA’s previous denial of NRDC’s objections, published in the Federal Register on August 10, 2005, was remanded to EPA by the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, for further explanation of EPA’s decision on the application of the FFDCA’s requirement concerning an additional tenfold safety factor for the protection of infants and children to these pesticide tolerances. In the challenged action, EPA had applied a reduced additional safety factor to several risk assessments for pymetrozine. EPA has reviewed its decision on the children’s safety factor in light of the current data on pymetrozine and now determined that the full additional children’s safety factor should be applied in assessing the risk of the pymetrozine tolerances. However, EPA still denies NRDC’s objections because the increase in the children’s safety factor does not change EPA’s conclusion that the tolerances are safe. EPA’s explanation for its decisions on the children’s safety factor and the safety of pymetrozine tolerances are included in this regulation.

DATES:

This regulation is effective August 6, 2010. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before October 5, 2010, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

Pymetrozine; Regulation Denying NRDC’s Objections on Remand

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final Regulation.

SUMMARY: In this regulation, EPA again denies objections by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) to an action establishing tolerance regulations for the pesticide pymetrozine under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). EPA’s previous denial of NRDC’s objections, published in the Federal Register on August 10, 2005, was remanded to EPA by the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, for further explanation of EPA’s decision on the application of the FFDCA’s requirement concerning an additional tenfold safety factor for the protection of infants and children to these pesticide tolerances. In the challenged action, EPA had applied a reduced additional safety factor to several risk assessments for pymetrozine. EPA has reviewed its decision on the children’s safety factor in light of the current data on pymetrozine and now determined that the full additional children’s safety factor should be applied in assessing the risk of the pymetrozine tolerances. However, EPA still denies NRDC’s objections because the increase in the children’s safety factor does not change EPA’s conclusion that the tolerances are safe. EPA’s explanation for its decisions on the children’s safety factor and the safety of pymetrozine tolerances are included in this regulation.

B. How Can I Access Electronic Copies of this Document?


C. Can I File an Objection or Hearing Request?

Under section 408(g) of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection...