

ethical conduct and other responsibilities applicable to Peace Corps employees. These regulations have been superseded, in significant part, by government-wide regulations.

DATES: Comments must be received by March 7, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to the Office of the General Counsel, 8th Floor, 1111 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20526.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carl R. Sosebee, Designated Agency Ethics Official, 202-692-2150.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Part 307, which sets out Peace Corps' regulations regarding the ethical conduct and other responsibilities of Peace Corps employees was last revised in 1987, *see* 52 FR 30151, Aug. 13, 1987; 22 CFR part 307. The conduct and responsibilities covered in this part have been superseded by the Office of Government Ethics' (OGE) executive branch ethical standards and requirements codified at 5 CFR parts 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638 and 2640. Further, rules governing partisan political activity by executive branch employees and rules governing gambling, betting and lotteries on government owned or leased property or while on duty are set forth at 5 CFR parts 734 and 735. Government-wide rules on procurement integrity are set forth in the Procurement Integrity Act, 41 U.S.C. 423, and the Federal Acquisition Regulations, 48 CFR 3.104. Because Peace Corps employees are already subject to these various rules, the Peace Corps proposes to remove part 307 from the Code of Federal Regulations. Remaining portions of the Peace Corps' existing standards pertaining to economic and financial activities of employees abroad, information, and speeches and participation in conferences set forth in Sections 307.735, 308, 309 and 310, respectively, may be reissued as Agency internal regulations pursuant to the authority of the Director in 22 U.S.C. 2503. Also, to the extent part 307 covers organizational conflicts of interest in procurement and procurement related matters, the Peace Corps is considering whether to incorporate them into the Peace Corps' internal rules.

II. Matters of Regulatory Procedure

Executive Order 12866. The Peace Corps has determined that this proposed rule does not constitute a "significant regulatory action" for the purposes of Executive Order 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act. Pursuant to section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Peace Corps certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Accordingly, no regulatory flexibility analysis is required.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Unfunded Mandates Act) (2 U.S.C. Chs. 17A and 25) requires that an agency prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes a federal mandate that may result in expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year. If a budgetary impact statement is required, agencies must also identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives before promulgating a rule. The Peace Corps has determined that this rule will not result in expenditures by State, local, or tribal governments or by the private sector of \$100 million or more. Accordingly, the Peace Corps has not prepared a budgetary impact statement or specifically addressed the regulatory alternatives considered.

List of Subjects in 22 CFR Part 307

Political activities; Government employees; Ethical conduct; Financial disclosure, Conflicts of interest.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Peace Corps proposes to amend Title 22 of the CFR by removing part 307.

Dated: January 31, 2003.

Tyler S. Posey,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 03-2703 Filed 2-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6015-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-03-002]

RIN 2115-AE47

**Drawbridge Operation Regulations;
Shrewsbury River, NJ**

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the drawbridge operating regulations governing the operation of the Route 36 Bridge, mile 1.8, across the

Shrewsbury River at Highlands, New Jersey. This proposed change to the drawbridge operation regulations would synchronize the drawbridge opening schedules for the two moveable bridges across the Shrewsbury River during the boating season. This action is necessary to meet the present needs of navigation.

DATES: Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before April 7, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to Commander (obr), First Coast Guard District Bridge Branch, One South Street, Battery Park Building, New York, New York 10004, 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 (212) 668-7165. 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: Joe Arca, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (212) 668-7165.

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 (CGD01-03-002), 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**.

Background

The Route 36 Bridge, mile 1.8, across the Shrewsbury River at Highlands, New Jersey, has a vertical clearance of 35 feet at mean high water and 39 feet at mean low water.

The existing regulations listed at 33 CFR 117.755, require the Route 36 Bridge to open on signal; except that, from May 15 through October 15, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., the draw need open only at quarter before the hour and quarter after the hour.

The Coast Guard received requests from mariners to change the drawbridge operation regulations that govern the Route 36 Bridge. Presently the two moveable bridges across the Shrewsbury River, the Route 36 Bridge, and the Monmouth County highway bridge, have staggered opening schedules during the boating season. The mariners have asked the Coast Guard to change the opening schedule for the Route 36 Bridge in order to synchronize the bridge opening times for the two moveable bridges during the boating season to help reduce vessel transit delays and enhance boating safety.

The second moveable bridge across the Shrewsbury River, the Monmouth County highway bridge, at mile 4.0, is required to open on signal; except that, from May 15 through September 30, on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m., the draw need open only on the hour and half hour.

This proposed rule if adopted would synchronize the bridge opening times at the two bridges by requiring the Route 36 Bridge to open on signal from May 15 through October 15, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., on the hour and half hour only.

This proposed change is expected to better meet the present needs of navigation.

Discussion of Proposal

This proposed change would amend 33 CFR 117.755 by revising paragraph (a), which lists the Route 36 Bridge drawbridge operation regulations. This proposed change would allow the Route 36 Bridge to open on signal; except that, from May 15 through October 15, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., the draw need open only on the hour and half hour.

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 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, Feb. 26, 1979).

We expect 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 conclusion is based on the fact that the synchronization of the opening times for the moveable bridges across the Shrewsbury River will better meet the present needs of navigation.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we 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 section 5 U.S.C. 605(b), that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This conclusion is based on the fact that the synchronization of the opening times for the moveable bridges across the Shrewsbury River will better meet the present needs of navigation.

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.

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 an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under E.O. 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 may 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, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

To help the Coast Guard establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian and Alaskan Native tribes, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 36361, July 11, 2001) requesting comments on how to best carry out the Order. 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 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 proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1d, this proposed rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation because promulgation of drawbridge regulations have been found not to have a significant effect on the environment. A written "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is not required for this rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

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

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05-1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102-587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.755 is amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 117.755 Shrewsbury River.

(a) The Route 36 Bridge, mile 1.8, at Highlands, New Jersey, shall open on signal; except that, from May 15 through October 15, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., the draw need open on the hour and half hour only. The owners of the bridge shall provide and keep in good legible condition, two clearance gauges, with figures not less than eight inches high, designed, installed, and maintained according to the provisions of § 118.160 of this chapter.

* * * * *

Dated: January 23, 2003.

Vivien S. Crea,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 03-2696 Filed 2-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

33 CFR Part 385

RIN 0710-AA49

Programmatic Regulations for the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan

AGENCY: Army Corps of Engineers, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Council on Environmental Quality will host a public meeting for stakeholders to clarify and respond to comments filed on the proposed rule to establish programmatic regulations for the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. Congress approved the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan in section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, Public Law 106-541, 114 Stat. 2680, which was enacted into law on December 11, 2000. The Act requires the Secretary of the Army to promulgate programmatic regulations, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Florida, to ensure that the goals and purposes of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan are achieved.

DATES: The public meeting will take place on February 6, 2003, from 1 to 5 pm.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Council on Environmental Quality, White House Conference Center, Truman Room, 3rd Floor, 726 Jackson Place, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stu Appelbaum, Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville District, P.O. Box 4970, Jacksonville, Florida 32232-0019, phone (904) 232-1877; fax (904) 232-1434.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 2, 2002 the Army published the proposed rule to establish the programmatic regulations in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 50540). The public comment period on the proposed rule closed on October 1, 2002. The proposed regulations establish processes and procedures that will guide the Army Corps of Engineers and its partners in the implementation of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. The purpose of the public meeting is to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to clarify and respond to comments filed on the proposed rule. Representatives of the Army (the rule writing agency), the Department of the

Interior and State of Florida (from whom concurrence on the final rule is required by statute) and other Federal agencies who will likely participate in the interagency review of the rule under Executive Order 12866 will be in attendance to listen to stakeholder views. The meeting will be facilitated by the Council on Environmental Quality.

Authority: Section 601, Public Law 106-541, 114 Stat. 2680; 10 U.S.C. 3013(g)(3); 33 U.S.C. 1 and 701; and 5 U.S.C. 301.

Dated: January 31, 2003.

George S. Dunlop,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army.

[FR Doc. 03-2776 Filed 2-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 03-154; MB Docket No. 03-12, RM-10627; MB Docket No. 03-13, RM-10628; and MB Docket No. 03-14, RM-10629]

Radio Broadcasting Services: Johnston City and Marion, Illinois; Fredericksburg and Mason, Texas; Charles Town, West Virginia and Stephens City, Virginia

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on proposals in three separately docketed proceedings in a multiple docket *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*. The first, filed by Cleveland Radio Licenses, LLC, proposes to change Station WXVA-FM's community of license from Charles Town, West Virginia, to Stephens City, Virginia, and provide Stephens City with its first local aural transmission service. The coordinates for requested Channel 252A at Stephens City, Virginia are 39-07-30 NL and 78-04-26 WL, with a site restriction of 13.3 kilometers (8.3 miles) east of Stephens City, Virginia. The second, filed by Clear Channel Broadcasting Licenses, Inc., proposes to change Station WDDD-FM's community of license from Marion, Illinois to Johnston City, Illinois, and provide Johnston City with its first local FM transmission station. The coordinates for requested Channel 297B at Johnston City, Illinois, are 37-45-15 NL and 88-56-05 WL, with a site restriction of 7.4 kilometers (4.6 miles) south of Johnston City, Illinois. The third proposal was filed by Jayson and Janice Fritz. They hold a construction permit to operate a