with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This proposed temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. The proposed temporary rule only involves the operation of an existing drawbridge and will not have any impact on the environment. A ''Categorical Exclusion Determination'' is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For reasons discussed 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 authority of Pub.L.102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.829 is revised to read as follows:

§ 117.829 Northeast Cape Fear River.

(a) The draw of the Isabel S. Holmes Bridge, at mile 1.0, at Wilmington, North Carolina will operate as follows:

(1) The draw will be closed to pleasure craft from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. every day except at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. when the draw will open for all waiting vessels.

(2) The draw will open on signal for Government and commercial vessels at all times.

(3) The draw will open for all vessels on request signal from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.

(b) The draw of the Seaboard System Railroad Bridge across the Northeast Cape Fear River, mile 27.0, at Castle Hayne, North Carolina shall open on signal if at least 4 hours notice is given.

Dated: May 16, 2002.

James D. Hull,

Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02–13510 Filed 5–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09–02–005]

RIN 2115–AA97

Security Zones; Captain of the Port Buffalo Zone

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish four permanent security zones on the navigable waters of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River in the Captain of the Port Buffalo Zone. These security zones are necessary to protect nuclear power plants and the St. Lawrence Seaway system from possible acts of terrorism. These security zones are intended to restrict vessel traffic from a portion of the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before July 1, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Buffalo, 1 Fuhrmann Blvd, Buffalo, New York 14203. The telephone number is (716) 843–9570. Marine Safety Office Buffalo maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and materials 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 between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LCDR David Flaherty, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Buffalo, at (716) 843–9574.

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 (CGD09–02–005), 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 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 U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Buffalo 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 and Purpose

On September 11, 2001, the United States was the target of coordinated attacks by international terrorists resulting in catastrophic loss of life, the destruction of the World Trade Center, and significant damage to the Pentagon. National security and intelligence officials warn that future terrorists attacks are likely.

This proposed rule would establish four permanent security zones: (1) Nine Mile Point and Fitzpatrick Nuclear Power Plants; (2) Moses-Saunders Power Dam; (3) Long Sault Spillway Dam; and (4) Ginna Nuclear Power Plant.

These security zones are necessary to protect the public, facilities, and the surrounding area from possible sabotage or other subversive acts. All persons other than those approved by the Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his designated representative, would be prohibited from entering or moving within this zone. The Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his on scene representative, may be contacted via VHF Channel 16 for further instructions before transiting through the restricted area. In addition to publication in the **Federal Register**, the public will be made aware of the existence of these security zones, exact locations, and the restrictions involved via Local Notice to Mariners and Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

Following the catastrophic nature and extent of damage realized from the attacks of September 11, this proposed rulemaking is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States against future attacks.

On September 27, 2001, we published several temporary final rules establishing the following security zones: on the waters of Lake Ontario around Nine Mile Point and Fitzpatrick Nuclear Power Plants (66 FR 49285); on the waters of the St. Lawrence River around the Moses-Saunders Power Dam (66 FR 49288); and on the waters of Lake Ontario around Ginna Nuclear Power Plant (66 FR 49284).

This current rulemaking proposes to establish permanent security zones that are smaller in size in place of those temporary security zones already established for the Moses-Saunders Power Dam and the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant.

This proposed rule would establish an additional security zone on the St. Lawerence River around the Long Sault Spillway Dam. Currently, a security zone is not in place surrounding the spillway.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 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 exempted it from review 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 proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

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.

The proposed security zones will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This proposed rule would not obstruct the regular flow of commercial traffic and would allow vessel traffic to pass around the security zones.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed 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 proposed rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the office listed in **ADDRESSES** in this preamble. Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

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

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

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 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.

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.lC, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. 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.

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, 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

§ 165.T09–999 [Removed]

2. Remove § 165.T09–999.

§ 165.T09–101 [Removed]

3. Remove § 165.T09–101.

§ 165.T09–103 [Removed]

4. Remove § 165.T09–103.

5. Add § 165.911 to read as follows:

§ 165.911 Security Zones; Captain of the Port Buffalo Zone.

(a) *Location.* The following are security zones:

(1) *Nine Mile Point and Fitzpatrick Nuclear Power Plants.* The waters of Lake Ontario bounded by the following area, starting at 43°30.8′ N, 076°25.7′ W; then north to 43°31.2′ N, 076°25.7′ W; then east-northeast to 43°31.6′ N, 076°24.9′ W; then east to 43°31.8′ N, 076°23.2′ W; then south to 43°31.5′ N, 076°23.2′ W; and then following the shoreline back to the point of origin (NAD 83).

(2) *Ginna Nuclear Power Plant.* The waters of Lake Ontario bounded by the following area, starting at 43°16.9′ N, 077°18.9′ W; then north to 43°17.3′ N, 077°18.9′ W; then east to 43°17.3′ N, 077°18.3′ W; then south to 43°16.7′ N, 077°18.3′ W; then following the shoreline back to starting point (NAD 83).

(3) *Moses-Saunders Power Dam.* The waters of the St. Lawrence River bounded by the following area, starting at 45°00.73′ N, 074°47.85′ W; southeast following the international border to 45°00.25′ N, 074°47.56′ W; then southwest to 45°00.16′ N, 074°47.76′ W; then east to the shoreline at 45°00.16′ N, 074°47.93′ W; then northwest to 45°00.36′ N, 074°48.16′ W; then northeast back to the starting point (NAD 83).

(4) *Long Sault Spillway Dam.* The waters of the St. Lawrence River bounded by the following area, starting at 44°59.5′ N, 074°52.0′ W; north to 45°00.0′ N, 074°52.0′ W; east to 45°00.0′ N, 074°51.6′ W, then south to 44°59.5′ N, 074°51.6′ W; then west back to the starting point (NAD 83).

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with § 165.33, entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Buffalo.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the Nine Mile Point and Fitzpatrick Nuclear Power Plants or Ginna Nuclear Power Plant security zones must contact the Captain of the Port Buffalo at telephone number (716) 843–9570, or on VHF/FM channel 16 to seek permission to transit the area. Persons desiring to transit the area of the Moses-Saunders Power Dam or Long Sault Spillway Dam security zones must contact the Supervisor, Marine Safety Detachment Massena at telephone number (315) 764–3284, or on VHF/FM channel 16 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 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.

Dated: May 17, 2002.

S.D. Hardy,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Buffalo.

[FR Doc. 02–13515 Filed 5–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 25

[IB DOCKET NO. 02–30; FCC 02–37]

Licensing Domestic Satellite Earth Stations in the Bush Communities of Alaska

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is proposing to terminate its Alaska Bush Earth Station Policy. The policy bars telephone carriers from obtaining licenses to install and operate satellite earth stations to provide interexchange service in any rural Alaskan community of less than 1,000 population where such service is already available through a satellite link provided by another carrier. The Bush Policy, which stems from a 1972 decision, is an exception to the FCC's current general policy of allowing facilities-based competition in carriage of interstate, interexchange telephone calls. Last year the Regulatory Commission of Alaska repealed a mirror-image regulation barring facilities-based competition in carriage of intrastate calls to or from Bush communities. The Commission contends that no showing has ever been made that the Bush exception to the