

IV. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12630—Takings

This rule does not have takings implications. This determination is based on the analysis performed for the counterpart Federal regulation.

Executive Order 12866—Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12988—Civil Justice Reform

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 and has determined that this rule meets the applicable standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments because each program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(h)(10), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the States must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

Executive Order 13132—Federalism

This rule does not have federalism implications. SMCRA delineates the roles of the Federal and State governments with regard to the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations. One of the purposes of SMCRA is to “establish a nationwide program to protect society and the environment from the adverse effects of surface coal mining operations.” Section 102(a), 30 U.S.C. 1202(a), Section 503(a)(1) of SMCRA requires that state laws regulating surface coal mining and reclamation operations be “in accordance with” the requirements of SMCRA. Section 503(a)(7) requires that state programs contain rules and regulations “consistent with” regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to SMCRA.

Executive Order 13211—Regulations That Significantly Affect the Supply, Distribution, or Use of Energy

On May 18, 2001, the President issued Executive Order 13211 which requires

agencies to prepare a Statement of Energy Effects for a rule that is (1) considered significant under Executive Order 12866, and (2) likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Because this rule is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866 and is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy, a Statement of Energy Effects is not required.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule does not require an environmental impact statement because section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that 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 government 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 934

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: December 6, 2002.

Peter A. Rutledge,

Acting Regional Director, Western Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 03–3366 Filed 2–10–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP San Diego 03–010]

RIN 2115-AA97

Security Zones; San Diego Bay, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to expand the geographical boundaries of the permanent security zones at Naval Base San Diego; Naval Submarine Base, San Diego; and Naval Base Coronado, California at the request of the U.S. Navy. Modification and expansion of these security zones is needed to ensure the physical protection of naval vessels moored within each zone by accommodating the Navy's placement of anti-small boat barrier booms within the zones. Entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP); Commander, Naval Base San Diego; Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet; Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet Representative, West Coast; Commander, Naval Base

Coronado; or the Commanding Officer, Naval Station, San Diego.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before April 14, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Diego, 2716 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, California, 92101. Marine Safety Office San Diego, Port Operations Department maintains the public docket for these rulemakings. 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 Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Diego, 2716 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, California, 92101, between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Joseph Brown, Port Safety and Security, at (619) 683-6495.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in these rulemakings by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [COTP San Diego 03-010], 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 these proposed rules 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 San Diego at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid these rulemakings, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

On September 16th and 17th, 2002, the Coast Guard published three temporary final rules suspending 33 CFR 165.1101, 33 CFR 165.1103, and 33 CFR 165.1104 and implementing

temporary security zones at Naval Base San Diego, Naval Base Coronado, and Naval Submarine Base San Diego. See 67 FR 58524, 67 FR 58526, and 67 FR 58333. Modified versions of these zones have been in place since 1998 and the Coast Guard has not received any comments during that time and no negative incidents have been reported.

The U.S. Navy requested that Coast Guard implement these security zones in coordination with their installation of anti-small boat barrier booms at the three locations. If you would like to obtain information about the U.S. Navy's action, contact the Assistant Chief of Port Operations, Navy Region Southwest at 619-556-2400.

The Coast Guard proposes to modify the security zones to allow the U.S. Navy to put anti-small boat barrier booms at Naval Base San Diego (33 CFR 165.1101); Naval Submarine Base, San Diego (33 CFR 165.1103); and Naval Base Coronado (33 CFR 165.1104). The modification and expansion of these security zones is needed to ensure the physical protection of naval vessels moored in the area by providing adequate stand-off distance. The Coast Guard's action supports the Navy's action and is limited to the expansion of the existing zones.

The modification and expansion of these security zones will also prevent recreational and commercial craft from interfering with military operations involving all naval vessels home-ported at Naval Base Coronado, Naval Submarine Base San Diego, and Naval Base San Diego, and it will protect transiting recreational and commercial vessels, and their respective crews, from the navigational hazards posed by such military operations. It will also safeguard vessels and waterside facilities from destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature. Entry into, transit through, or anchoring within this security zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port San Diego; Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet; Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet Representative, West Coast; Commander, U.S. Naval Base San Diego; Commander, Navy Region Southwest; Commanding Officer, Naval Station, San Diego; or Commander, Naval Base Coronado.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

Specifically, the Coast Guard is expanding the security zone boundaries at the request of the U.S. Navy so that the U.S. Navy can install anti-small boat barrier booms.

In its effort to thwart terrorist activity, the Coast Guard has increased safety and security measures on U.S. ports and waterways. As part of the Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-399), Congress amended section 7 of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA), 33 U.S.C. 1226, to allow the Coast Guard to take actions, including the establishment of security and safety zones, to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism against individuals, vessels, or public or commercial structures. The Coast Guard also has authority to establish security zones pursuant to the Act of June 15, 1917, as amended by the Magnuson Act of August 9, 1950 (50 U.S.C. 191 *et seq.*) and implementing regulations promulgated by the President in Subparts 6.01 and 6.04 of Part 6 of Title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Vessels or persons violating this section will be subject to the penalties set forth in 33 U.S.C. 1232 and 50 U.S.C. 192. Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1232, any violation of the security zone described herein, is punishable by civil penalties (not to exceed \$27,500 per violation, where each day of a continuing violation is a separate violation), criminal penalties (imprisonment up to 6 years and a maximum fine of \$250,000), and in rem liability against the offending vessel. Any person who violates this section, using a dangerous weapon, or who engages in conduct that causes bodily injury or fear of imminent bodily injury to any officer authorized to enforce this regulation, also faces imprisonment up to 12 years. Vessels or persons violating this section are also subject to the penalties set forth in 50 U.S.C. 192: seizure and forfeiture of the vessel to the United States, a maximum criminal fine of \$10,000, and imprisonment up to 10 years, and a civil penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each day of a continuing violation.

The Captain of the Port will enforce these zones and may enlist the aid and cooperation of any Federal, State, county, municipal, and private agency to assist in the enforcement of the regulation. This regulation is proposed under the authority of 33 U.S.C. 1226 in addition to the authority contained in 50 U.S.C. 191 and 33 U.S.C. 1231.

Regulatory Evaluation

These proposed rules are not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and do 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 them under that Order. They

are not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040, February 26, 1979).

We expect the economic impact of these proposed rules to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

Due to National Security interests, the implementation of these security zones is necessary for the protection of the United States and its people. The size of the zone is the minimum necessary to provide adequate protection for U.S. Naval vessels, their crews, adjoining areas, and the public. The entities most likely to be affected, if any, are pleasure craft engaged in recreational activities and sightseeing. Any hardships experienced by persons or vessels are considered minimal compared to the national interest in protecting U.S. Naval vessels, their crews, and the public.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether these proposed rules 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 these proposed rules would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the expanded zones will still allow sufficient room for vessels to transit the channel unimpeded.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that these rules 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 these rules 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 these proposed rules so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemakings. If the proposed rules would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions

concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact LT Joseph Brown, Marine Safety Office San Diego at (619) 683–6495.

Collection of Information

These proposed rules 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 these proposed rules under that Order and have determined that they do 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 these proposed rules would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

These proposed rules 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

These proposed rules meet 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 these proposed rules under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. These rules are 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

These proposed rules do not have tribal implications under Executive

Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because they 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 these proposed rules might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a “tribal implication” under the Order.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed these proposed rules under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that these are not a “significant energy action” under that order because they are not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and are not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. They have not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as significant energy actions. Therefore, they do not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of these proposed rules and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, these rules are categorically excluded from further environmental documentation because our action is limited to the expansion of existing security zones. The U.S. Navy has separately considered the impact of their proposed project including the placement of anti-small boat barrier booms. While we reviewed the Navy’s environmental documentation, our analysis pertains solely to the expanded placement of the small markers designating the security zones already in the waterway. “Categorical Exclusion Determinations” are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

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. 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.

2. Revise § 165.1101 to read as follows:

§ 165.1101 Security Zone: San Diego Bay, CA.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: the water area within Naval Station, San Diego enclosed by the following points: Beginning at 32°41'16.5" N, 117°08'01" W (Point A); thence running southwesterly to 32°41'02.5" N, 117°08'08.5" W (Point B); to 32°40'55.0" N 117°08'00.0" W (Point C); to 32°40' 49.5" N 117°07'55.5" W (Point D); to 32°40'44.6" N, 117°07'49.3" W (Point E); to 32°40'37.8 N 117°07'43.2" W, (Point F); to 32°40'30.9" N, 117°07'39.0" W (Point G); 32°40'24.5" N, 117°07'35.0" W (Point H); to 32°40'17.2" N, 117°07'30.8" W (Point I); to 32°40'10.6" N, 117°07'30.5" W (Point J); to 32°39'59.0" N, 117°07'29.0" W (Point K); to 32°39'49.8" N, 117°07'27.2" W (Point L); to 32°39'43.0" N, 117°07'25.5" W (Point M); 32°39'36.5" N, 117°07'24.2" W, (Point N); thence running easterly to 32°39'38.5" N, 117°07'06.5" W (Point O); thence running generally northwesterly along the shoreline of the Naval Station to the place of beginning. All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 1983.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in §165.33 of this part, entry into the area of this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port San Diego; Commander, Naval Base San Diego; Commander, Navy Region Southwest; or the Commanding Officer, Naval Station, San Diego.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number 619–683–6495 or on VHF channel 16 (156.8 MHz) to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

(d) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of this security zone by the U. S. Navy.

3. Revise § 165.1103 to read as follows:

§ 165.1103 Security Zone: San Diego Bay, CA.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: The water adjacent to the Naval Submarine Base, San Diego commencing on a point on the shoreline of Ballast Point, at 32°41'11.2" N, 117°13'57.0" W (Point A), thence northerly to 32°41'31.8" N, 117°14'00.6" W (Point B), thence westerly to 32°41'32.7" N, 117°14'03.2" W (Point C), thence southwesterly to 32°41'30.5" N, 117°14'17.5" W (Point D), thence generally southeasterly along the shoreline of the Naval Submarine Base to the point of beginning, (Point A). All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 1983.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entry into the area of this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port San Diego; Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet Representative, West Coast; or Commander, Naval Base San Diego.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number 619–683–6495 or on VHF channel 16 (156.8 MHz) to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

(d) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of this security zone by the U.S. Navy.

4. Revise § 165.1104 to read as follows:

§ 165.1104 Security Zone: San Diego Bay, CA.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: on the waters along the northern shoreline of Naval Base Coronado, the area enclosed by the following points: Beginning at 32°42'53.0"N, 117°11'45.0" W (Point A); thence running northerly to 32°42'55.5"N, 117°11'45.0"W, (Point B); thence running easterly to 32°42'57.0"N, 117°11'31.0"W, (Point C); thence southeasterly to 32°42'42.0"N, 117°11'04.0"W (Point D); thence southeasterly to 32°42'21.0"N, 117°10'47.0"W (Point E) thence running southerly to 32 °42'13.0" N, 117 °10'51.0" W (Point F); thence running generally northwesterly along the shoreline of Naval Base Coronado to the place of beginning. All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 1983.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33, entry into the area of this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port San Diego; Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet; Commander, Navy Region Southwest; or Commanding Officer, Naval Base Coronado.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number 619–683–6495 or on VHF channel 16 (156.8 MHz) to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

(d) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of this security zone by the U.S. Navy.

Dated: January 23, 2003.

Stephen P. Metruck,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, San Diego, California.

[FR Doc. 03–3263 Filed 2–10–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY**44 CFR Part 67**

[Docket No. FEMA–D–7554]

Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Technical information or comments are requested on the proposed base (1% annual chance) flood elevations and proposed base flood elevation modifications for the communities listed below. The base flood elevations are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

EFFECTIVE DATE: The comment period is ninety (90) days following the second publication of this proposed rule in a newspaper of local circulation in each community.

ADDRESSES: The proposed base flood elevations for each community are