#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Coast Guard** 

33 CFR Parts 110 and 165 [CGD14-02-001] RIN 2115-AA97

Anchorages and Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; change of effective period.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to extend the effective period of security zones in designated waters adjacent to the islands of Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI for a period of 6 months beyond their current October 19, 2002, expiration date. These security zones and a related amendment to regulations for anchorage grounds in Mamala Bay we also propose to extend are necessary to protect personnel, vessels, and facilities from acts of sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature during operations and will extend from the surface of the water to the ocean floor. Entry into the proposed zones would be prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Honolulu, HI.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 8, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Honolulu, 433 Ala Moana Blvd., Honolulu, Hawaii 96813. Marine Safety Office Honolulu 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 Honolulu between 7 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

LTJG E. G. Cantwell, U. S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Honolulu, Hawaii at (808) 522–8260.

### 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 (CGD14–02–001), 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 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.

The deadline to submit comments is less than 60 days from the publication of the notice of proposed rules (NPRM) in the Federal Register. This short comment period will permit the Coast Guard to publish a temporary final rule before expiration of the existing temporary security zone, and thus maintain public safety and security. To provide additional notice, we will place a notice of our proposed rule in the local notice to mariners. You may request a copy of this notice via facsimile by calling (808) 522–8260.

In our final rule, we will include a concise general statement of comments received and identify any changes from the proposed rule based on the comments. If, as we expect, we make the final rule effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**, we will explain our good cause for doing so as required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

#### **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 Honolulu 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 separate notice in the Federal Register.

#### **Background and Purpose**

Terrorist attacks in New York City, New York, and on the Pentagon Building in Arlington, Virginia, on September 11, 2001, have called for the implementation of additional measures to protect national security. National security and intelligence officials warn that future terrorist attacks against civilian targets may be anticipated. This proposed rule is similar to a rule published April 29, 2002, (67 FR 20907) creating security zones in these areas until October 19, 2002.

#### **Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The Coast Guard proposes designated security zones in the waters adjacent to the islands of Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI for a period of 6 months. These security zones are necessary to protect personnel, vessels, and facilities from acts of sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature during operations.

In addition to extending the period of security zones, we are also proposing to give names to security zones and make a few editorial, non-substantive changes. These proposed security zones would extend from the surface of the water to the ocean floor.

This proposed rule would also amend an anchorage grounds regulation by adding the requirement that permission of the Captain of the Port be obtained before entering anchorage grounds in Mamala Bay.

Entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Honolulu, HI. Representatives of the Captain of the Port Honolulu will enforce these security zones. The Captain of the Port may be assisted by other federal or state agencies. Periodically, by Broadcast Notice to Mariners, the Coast Guard will announce the existence or status of the temporary security zones in this proposed rule.

This temporary proposed rule is intended to provide for the safety and security of the public, maritime commerce, and transportation, by extending security zones in designated harbors, anchorages, facilities, and adjacent navigable waters of the United States.

## **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 Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040, February 26, 1979).

The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. This expectation is based on the short duration of the zone and the limited geographic zone affected by it.

## **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. No small business impacts are anticipated due to the small size of the zones and the short duration of the security zones in any one area.

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**

Because we did not anticipate any small business impacts, we did not offer assistance to small entities in understanding the rule.

#### **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 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. 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. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

#### **Environment**

We have considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A

"Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES.

### **List of Subjects**

33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR parts 110 and 165 as follows:

## PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2030, 2035, 2071; 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 1.05–1(g).

2. In § 110.235, paragraph (c) added at 67 FR 20907, April 29, 2002, effective 6 a.m. April 19, 2002, until 4 p.m. October 19, 2002, is extended in effect until 4 p.m. April 19, 2003.

## PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

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

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

4. Revise temporary § 165.T14–069 to read as follows:

## § 165.T14-069 Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI.

- (a) Location. The following areas, from the surface of the water to the ocean floor, are security zones—
- (1) Honolulu Harbor. All waters of Honolulu Harbor and entrance channel, Keehi Lagoon, and General Anchorages A, B, C, and D as defined in 33 CFR 110.235 that are shoreward of a line connecting the following coordinates: A point on the shoreline at 21°17.68′ N, 157°52.0′ W; thence due south to 21°16.0′ N, 157°52.0′ W, thence due west to 21°16.0′ N, 157°55.58′ W, and thence due north to Honolulu International Airport Reef Runway at 21°18.25′ N, 157°55.58′ W.
- (2) Tesoro Single Point Mooring. The waters around the Tesoro Single Point Mooring extending 1,000 yards in all directions from position 21°16.2′ N, 158°05.3′ W.
- (3) Chevron Conventional Buoy Mooring. The waters extending 1,000 yards in all directions around vessels

moored at the Chevron Conventional Buoy Mooring at approximate position 21°16.7′ N, 158°04.2′ W.

(4) Kahului Harbor and Entrance Channel, Maui, HI. All waters in the Kahului Harbor and Entrance Channel, Maui, HI, shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION line defined in 33 CFR

- (5) Nawiliwili Harbor, Kauai, HI. All waters within the Nawiliwili Harbor, Kauai, HI shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION line defined in 33 CFR 80 1450
- (6) Port Allen Harbor, Kauai, HI. All waters of Port Allen Harbor, Kauai, HI shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION line defined in 33 CFR 80.1440.
- (7) Hilo Harbor and Entrance Channel, Hawaii, HI. All waters in Hilo Harbor and Entrance Channel, Hawaii, HI shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION line defined in 33 CFR 80.1480.
- (8) Area Around Cruise Ships in Lahaina Small Boat Harbor, Maui, and Kailua-Kona Small Boat Harbor, Hawaii. The waters extending out 500 yards in all directions from cruise ship vessels anchored within 3 miles of:
- (i) Lahaina Small Boat Harbor, Maui, between Makila Point and Puunoa Point.
- (ii) Kailua-Kona Small Boat Harbor, Hawaii, between Keahulolu Point and Puapuaa Point.
- (9) Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu. All waters contained within the Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, enclosed by a line drawn between Harbor Entrance Channel Light 6 and the jetty point day beacon at 21°19.5′ N, 158°07.3′ W.
- (b) Designated representative: A designated representative of the Captain of the Port is any Coast Guard commissioned officer, warrant or petty officer that has been authorized by the Captain of the Port Honolulu to act on his behalf. The following officers have or will be designated by the Captain of the Port Honolulu: The senior Coast Guard boarding officer on each vessel enforcing the security zone.
- (c) Regulations. (1) In accordance with § 165.33, entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Honolulu or his designated representatives. Section 165.33 also contains other general requirements.
- (2) The existence or status of the temporary security zones in this section will be announced periodically by Broadcast Notice to Mariners.
- (3) Persons desiring to transit the areas of the security zones may contact the Captain of the Port at command center telephone number (808) 541–

2477 or on VHF channel 16 (156.8 Mhz) to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his designated representatives.

(d) *Authority*. In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231, the authority for this section is 33 U.S.C. 1226; 49 CFR 1.46.

(e) Effective period. This section is effective from 6 a.m. HST April 19, 2002, until 4 p.m. HST April 19, 2003.

Dated: August 22, 2002.

#### R.D. Utley,

Rear Admiral, Coast Guard, Commander, Fourteenth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02–22340 Filed 8–30–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Coast Guard**

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-02-101]

RIN 2115-AE47

# Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Dorchester Bay, MA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the drawbridge operating regulations governing the operation of the William T. Morrisey Boulevard Bridge, at mile 0.0, across Dorchester Bay at Boston, Massachusetts. This proposed temporary change to the drawbridge operation regulations would allow the bridge to remain in the closed position from November 1, 2002 through May 10, 2003. This action is necessary to facilitate rehabilitation construction at the bridge.

**DATES:** Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 3, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to Commander (obr), First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02110-3350, or deliver them to the same address between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (617) 223-8364. The First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 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 the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.,

Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. John W. McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223–8364.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments or related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD01-02-101), 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 if they 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 the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 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.

### **Regulatory Information**

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) is being published with a shortened comment period of thirty days instead of the normal sixty day comment period because the bridge owner coordinated this closure with the members of the Dorchester Yacht Club, the sole marine facility upstream from the bridge, and the members of the yacht club agreed upon the time period that the bridge will be allowed to remain closed.

The Coast Guard anticipates that any temporary final rule enacted following public notice and comment may be effective in less than 30 days after publication.

Any delay encountered in this regulation's effective date would be unnecessary and contrary to the public interest because the rehabilitation construction is necessary in order to assure continued reliable operation of the bridge.