

require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rule: (a) Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million; (b) Will not cause a major increase in

costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local governmental agencies or geographic regions; and (c) Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises. This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of \$100 million or more in any given year. This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation did not impose an unfunded mandate.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 916

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: February 7, 2003.

Charles E. Sandberg,

Acting Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 30 CFR part 916 is amended as set forth below:

PART 916—KANSAS

1. The authority citation for part 916 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*

2. Section 916.12 is amended by revising the section heading to read as follows:

§ 916.12 State regulatory program and proposed program amendment provisions not approved.

3. Section 916.15 is amended in the table by adding a new entry in chronological order by “Date of final publication” to read as follows:

§ 916.15 Approval of Kansas regulatory program amendments.

* * * * *

Original amendment submission date	Date of final publication	Citation/description
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *
July 24, 2002	March 25, 2003	K.A.R. 47-2-75; 47-3-2, 42; 47-4-14a(c)(2); 47-5-5a, 17; 47-6-1, 2(d)(2), 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11; 47-7-2; 47-8-9; 47-9-1, 4; 47-10-1; 47-11-8; 47-12-4; 47-13-4; 47-14-7; 47-15-1a.

4. Section 916.25 is amended in the table by adding a new entry in

chronological order by “Date of final publication” to read as follows:

§ 916.25 Approval of Kansas abandoned mine land reclamation plan amendments.

* * * * *

Original amendment submission date	Date of final publication	Citation/description
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *
July 24, 2002	March 25, 2003	K.A.R. 47-16-9(a), 47-16-10(b), and 47-16-12.

[FR Doc. 03-7024 Filed 3-24-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Western Alaska 02-001]

RIN 1625-AA00 (Formerly 2115-AA97)

Security Zone; Liquefied Natural Gas Tankers, Cook Inlet, AK

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard adopts, as final, the interim rule published in July 2002 that established security zones for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) tankers in Cook Inlet, AK, within the Western Alaska Marine Inspection Zone and Captain of the Port Zone. This final rule includes an effective information collection requirement calling for vessel and crew information from the owners or operators of commercial fishing vessels desiring to fish within the security zone.

DATES: On September 4, 2002, OMB approved the collection of information

required by 33 CFR 165.1709(b)(1)(ii) as published on July 1, 2002. This final rule is effective April 24, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket (COTP Western Alaska 02-001) and are available for inspection or copying at Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Anchorage, AK between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Mark McManus, USCG Marine Safety Detachment Kenai, at (907) 283-3292 or Lieutenant Commander Chris Woodley, USCG Marine Safety Office Anchorage, at (907) 271-6700.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

On July 1, 2002 we published an interim rule with requests for comments entitled "Security Zone, Liquefied Natural Gas Tankers, Cook Inlet, AK" in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 44057). We received no comments. No public hearing was requested, and none was held.

Background and Purpose

In its July 2002 interim rule, the Coast Guard established 1000-yard security zones around LNG tankers to safeguard the tankers, Nikiski marine terminals, the community of Nikiski, and the maritime community from sabotage or subversive acts and incidents of a similar nature. Paragraph 33 CFR 165.1709(b)(1)(ii) of that interim rule was not made effective because the Office of Management and Budget had not yet approved the collection of information called for by that paragraph. On September 4, 2002, OMB approved the collection of information. We are therefore adopting the interim rule as final and making paragraph 33 CFR 165.1709(b)(1)(ii) effective.

You can find more detailed background information in the preamble of the interim rule (67 FR 44057) under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12886, 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 rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. This finding is based on the minimal time that vessels will be restricted from the zone, that vessels may still transit through the waters of Cook Inlet and dock at other Nikiski marine terminals.

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.

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.

This rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in the vicinity of the Phillips Petroleum LNG Pier during the time this zone is activated; and the owners or operators of fishing vessels operating their nets in the vicinity of the Phillips Petroleum LNG Pier during the months of July through August.

These security zones will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Marine traffic will still be able to transit through Cook Inlet during the zones' activation. Additionally, vessels with cargo to load or unload from other Nikiski marine terminals in the vicinity of the zone will not be precluded from mooring at or getting underway from the terminals. The owners of fishing vessels that typically fish in the vicinity of the LNG pier during the summer months will not be prohibited from operating if they notify and provide information to the Coast Guard Marine Safety Detachment in Kenai before fishing in the security zone. The Coast Guard will collect information from them that is essential to keeping the pier secure from sabotage or subversive activities.

Collection of Information

The Captain of the Port, Western Alaska requires information on fishing vessel owners and operators, and their vessels and crew, desiring to fish in the security zone around the Phillips Petroleum LNG Pier. This information is

required to ensure port and vessel safety and security, to ensure uninterrupted fishing industry openings, to control vessel traffic, develop contingency plans, and enforce regulations. This collection of information is controlled by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under OMB control no. 1625-0043 (Formerly 2115-0540).

Recently, security zones were established for LNG tankers in Cook Inlet, AK through an interim rule published in the **Federal Register** on July 1, 2002 (67 FR 44057). A copy is available in the docket [COTP Western Alaska 02-001] under **ADDRESSES** or electronically through a Web site at http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/.

It became effective on July 6, 2002, with the exception of one paragraph, 33 CFR 165.1709(b)(1)(ii), which contains collection of information requirements. This rule modified an existing collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520).

As required by 44 U.S.C. 3507(d), we submitted a copy of the interim rule (which we have adopted as the final rule without change) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its review of the collection of information. On September 4, 2002, after reviewing the rule and the overall collection of information burden under OMB Control Number 1625-0043 (Formerly 2115-0540), OMB approved the collection of information required under this rule. The section number is 33 CFR 165.1709, and the corresponding approval number from OMB is OMB Control Number 1625-0043, which expires on September 30, 2005.

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 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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the

effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not effect 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 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 rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 final 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 considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that under figure 2-1, paragraph 34(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. This rule fits paragraph 34(g) as it

establishes a security zone. A "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

Accordingly, the interim rule amending 33 CFR part 165 that was published at 67 FR 44059 on July 1, 2002, is adopted as a final rule without change.

Dated: February 26, 2003.

H. Mark Hamilton,

Commander, Coast Guard, Acting Captain of the Port, Western Alaska.

[FR Doc. 03-6981 Filed 3-24-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Tampa 03-006]

RIN 1625-AA00

Security Zones; Tampa Bay, Port of Tampa, Port of Saint Petersburg, Port Manatee, Rattlesnake, Old Port Tampa, Big Bend, Weedon Island, and Crystal River, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing security zones in Tampa Bay, Port of Tampa, Port of Saint Petersburg, Port Manatee, Rattlesnake, Old Port Tampa, Big Bend, Weedon Island, and Crystal River, Florida. These zones are needed to ensure public safety and security in the greater Tampa Bay area. Entry into these zones would be prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or their designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from March 7, 2003 through June 30, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket [COTP Tampa 03-006] and are available for inspection or copying at Marine Safety Office Tampa, 155 Columbia Drive, Tampa, Florida 33606-

3598 between 7:30 a.m. and 3 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LCDR David McClellan, Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Tampa, at (813) 228-2189 extension 102.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM. Publishing an NPRM and delaying the effective date of this rule would be contrary to the public interest since immediate action is needed to continue to protect the public, ports and waterways of the United States. The Coast Guard will issue a broadcast notice to mariners and place Coast Guard vessels in the vicinity of these zones to advise mariners of the restriction.

For the same reasons, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The Coast Guard will issue a broadcast notice to mariners to advise mariners of the restriction. The Coast Guard will publish a NPRM proposing a permanent rule for security zones in these same locations and requesting public comment.

Background and Purpose

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, killed thousands of people and heightened the need for development of various security measures throughout the seaports of the United States, particularly those vessels and facilities which are frequented by foreign nationals and are of interest to national security. Following these attacks by well-trained and clandestine terrorists, national security and intelligence officials have warned that future terrorists attacks are likely. The Captain of the Port of Tampa has determined that these security zones are necessary to protect the public, ports, and waterways of the United States from potential subversive acts.

These security zones are similar to the existing temporary security zones established for vessels, waterfront facilities and bridges that will soon expire. The following seven existing temporary final rules were published in the **Federal Register**:

Security Zone for Crystal River, FL (66 FR 62940, December 4, 2001). This temporary rule created a fixed security zone around the Florida Power Crystal