

**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 concern 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 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 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 rule and concluded that under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. This final rule only involves removal of the drawbridge operation regulation for a drawbridge that has been removed from service. It 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.

**Regulations**

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard is amending Part 117 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations 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.

**§ 117.680 [Removed]**

2. Section 117.680 is removed.

Dated: November 5, 2002.

**Roy J. Casto,**

*Rear Admiral, Coast Guard, Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 02–28964 Filed 11–14–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165**

**[CGD01–01–187]**

**RIN 2115-AA84, AA97**

**Regulated Navigation Area, Safety and Security Zones; Long Island Sound Marine Inspection and Captain of the Port Zone**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule; change in effective period.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is extending the effective period of a regulated navigation area (RNA) and certain safety and security zones published January 4, 2002. This change will extend the effective period of the temporary final rule through March 15, 2003, allowing adequate time for informal rulemaking to develop a permanent rule. This rule will continue to regulate the conditions under which certain vessels may enter, transit or operate within the regulated navigation area and will exclude all vessels from operating within 700 yards of the Millstone Nuclear Power Plant or 100 yards of anchored Coast Guard vessels.

**DATES:** The amendments of §§ 165.T01–153 and 165.T01–154 in this rule are effective November 15, 2002. Sections 165.T01–153 and 165.T01–154, added at 67 FR 519 and 520, January 4, 2002, effective December 10, 2001 until June 15, 2002, and extended at 67 FR 40861, June 14, 2002 through November 15, 2002, as amended in this rule, are extended in effect through March 15, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents indicated in this preamble are available for inspection and copying at Waterways Management, Coast Guard Group/Marine Safety Office Long Island Sound, 120 Woodward Ave., New Haven, CT 06512, between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant A. Logman, Waterways Management, Coast Guard GP/MSO Long Island Sound at (203) 468–4429.

**Regulatory Information**

On January 4, 2002, we published a temporary final rule (TFR) entitled “Regulated Navigation Areas, Safety And Security Zones; Long Island Sound Marine Inspection Zone and Captain of the Port Zone” in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 517). The effective period for that rule was from December 10, 2001 until

June 15, 2002 and it was then extended through November 15, 2002. (67 FR 40859, June 14, 2002).

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. The original TFR was urgently required to prevent terrorist strikes within and adjacent to waters within the Long Island Sound Marine Inspection Zone and Captain of the Port Zone. It was anticipated that we would assess the security environment at the end of the effective period to determine whether continuing security precautions were required and, if so, propose regulations responsive to existing conditions. We have determined that the need for continued security regulations exists. The Coast Guard will utilize the extended effective period of this TFR to engage in notice and comment rulemaking to develop permanent regulations tailored to the present and foreseeable security environment within the Ports of Long Island Sound.

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 measures contemplated by the rule were intended to prevent future terrorist attacks. The delay inherent in the NPRM process for developing a permanent rule is contrary to the public interest insofar as it may render individuals, vessels and facilities within and adjacent to the Long Island Sound Marine Inspection Zone and Captain of the Port Zone vulnerable to subversive activity, sabotage or terrorist attack. The Coast Guard will be publishing a NPRM to establish permanent safety and security zones that are temporarily effective under this rule. This revision preserves the status quo within the Port while permanent rules are developed. The present TFR has not been burdensome on the maritime public. The Coast Guard has not received written comments or suggestion to modify the scope of the existing TFR.

#### **Background and Purpose**

On September 11, 2001, two commercial aircraft were hijacked from Logan Airport in Boston, MA and flown into the World Trade Center in New York, NY inflicting catastrophic human casualties and property damage. A similar attack was conducted on the Pentagon with a plane launched from Newark, NJ on the same day. National security and intelligence officials warn that future terrorist attacks against civilian targets may be anticipated. The Coast Guard established RNA's and

safety and security zones within defined areas of water as part of a comprehensive, port security regime designed to safeguard human life, vessels and waterfront facilities from sabotage or terrorist acts. As mentioned in the original TFR, these regulations were designed to provide the Captain of the Port of Long Island Sound with maximum flexibility to respond to emergent threats and dangerous conditions. When less stringent security measures are required, the Captain of the Port communicates relaxed enforcement policies to the public. As a result, the full scope of these regulations is rarely imposed. Nevertheless, the flexibility to utilize those measures permitted by the TFR and required by the circumstances is vital to ensure port security in the present environment.

A change in the effective period of this rule was published on June 14, 2002 (67 FR 40859), which extended the rule through November 15, 2002. This change was necessary in order to conduct rulemaking for the establishment of permanent safety and security zones and regulated navigation area. Additional time is necessary to ensure the public has sufficient time to participate in the rulemaking process. The Coast Guard is extending the effective date of this rule until March 15, 2003, to allow the establishment of permanent safety and security zones, and a regulated navigation area by notice and comment rulemaking.

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

The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this final rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. This finding is based on that the sizes of the zones are the minimum necessary to provide adequate protection for the public, vessels, and vessel crews. Any vessels seeking entry into or movement within the safety and security zones must request permission from the Captain of the Port or his authorized patrol representative. Any hardships experienced by persons or vessels are considered minimal compared to the

national interest protecting the public, vessels, and vessel crews from the further devastating consequences of the aforementioned acts of terrorism, and from potential future sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature.

The Coast Guard will be publishing a NPRM to establish permanent safety and security zones and the regulated navigation area that are temporarily effective under this rule.

#### **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.

For the reasons addressed under the "Regulatory Evaluation" above, the Coast Guard expects the impact of this regulation to be minimal and certifies under section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612) that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Maritime advisories will be initiated by normal methods and means and be widely available to users of the area.

#### **Assistance for Small Entities**

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. 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 Lieutenant A. Logman, Waterways Management, Coast Guard GP/MSO, Long Island Sound, (203) 468–4429.

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 rule calls for no new collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (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 rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

## Unfunded Mandates

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.

## 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.

## Environment

We have 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. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination” is available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

## 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.

## 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 amends 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 temporary § 165.T01–153(c) to read as follows:

### § 165.T01–153 Regulated Navigation Area; Long Island Sound Marine Inspection Zone and Captain of the Port Zone

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) *Effective dates.* This section is effective from December 10, 2001 through March 15, 2003.

\* \* \* \* \*

3. Revise temporary § 165.T01–154(b) to read as follows:

### § 165.T01–154 Safety and Security Zones; Long Island Sound Inspection Zone and Captain of the Port Zone

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) *Effective dates.* This section is effective from November 15, 2002 through March 15, 2003.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: November 7, 2002.

**V.S. Crea,**

*Rear Admiral, Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 02–29069 Filed 11–12–02; 4:49 pm]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

### Copyright Office

#### 37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. RM 2001–2A]

### Notice of Termination

**AGENCY:** Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Copyright Office is publishing a final rule amending its regulation governing notices of termination of transfers and licenses covering the extended renewal term. The current regulation is limited to notices of termination made under section 304(c) of the copyright law. The Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act created a separate termination right under section 304(d). The final rule establishes procedures governing notices of termination of the extended renewal term under either section 304(c) or section 304(d).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 1, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kent Dunlap, Principal Legal Advisor for the General Counsel. Telephone: (202) 707–8380. Telefax: (202) 707–8366.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### 1. Background

Under the 1909 copyright law, works copyrighted in the United States before January 1, 1978, were subject to a renewal system in which the term of copyright was divided into two consecutive terms. Under the system initially established by the 1909 legislation, the duration of copyright protection was for an original copyright term of 28 years and a renewal term of an additional 28 years. The Copyright Act of 1976, Public Law 94–554, retained the renewal system for works that were copyrighted before 1978, and were still in their first term on January 1, 1978. However, under section 304 of the copyright law, the renewal term was extended to 47 years, creating a total potential duration period of 75 years.