

at MacDill AFB are initially stopped at 1,600 feet MSL, southbound, in order to provide separation from Tampa arrivals and departures. When multiple aircraft are being vectored in the radar pattern for Runway 04 at MacDill AFB, the pattern often extends to the southwest of MacDill AFB as far as the Skyway Bridge and beyond.

In addition to the Tampa International Airport and MacDill AFB operations described above, the same general airspace is used by other aircraft descending into, or departing from, the Albert Whitted (SPG), St. Petersburg-Clearwater International (PIE), Peter O. Knight (TPF), and Sarasota-Bradenton International (SRQ) Airports. Arrivals to these airports are normally descended to 2,000 feet MSL to intercept the approach. The final approach paths for these airports lie within 10 nautical miles of each other.

The airspace segment from MacDill AFB southward to the Sarasota-Bradenton Class C airspace boundary contains a high volume of aircraft operations and a widely varied mix of instrument flight rules and visual flight rules aircraft operations.

Decision

Based on this latest study, the FAA has concluded that the current configuration of the Tampa Class B airspace area best provides for the safety and efficiency of operations within the Tampa terminal area.

In light of these considerations, the FAA has reexamined the proposed modification of the Tampa Class B airspace area and has decided to withdraw the proposal.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Withdrawal

In consideration of the foregoing, the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Airspace Docket No. 97-AWA-2, as published in the **Federal Register** on November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64016), is hereby withdrawn.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854; 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959-1963 Comp., p. 389.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 29, 2003.

Reginald C. Matthews,

Manager, Airspace and Rules Division.

[FR Doc. 03-2526 Filed 2-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD14-03-001]

RIN 2115-AA97

Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish permanent security zones in designated waters adjacent to the islands of Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI. These security zones and a related amendment to regulations for anchorage grounds in Mamala Bay are necessary to protect personnel, vessels, and facilities from acts of sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature during operations and will extend from the surface of the water to the ocean floor. Entry into the proposed zones would be prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Honolulu, HI.

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

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Honolulu, 433 Ala Moana Blvd., Honolulu, Hawaii 96813. Marine Safety Office Honolulu 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 Marine Safety Office Honolulu between 7 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

LTJG E. G. Cantwell, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Honolulu, Hawaii at (808) 522-8260.

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 (CGD14-03-001), 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 this proposed rule in view of them.

To provide additional notice, we will place a notice of our proposed rule in the local notice to mariners. You may request a copy of this notice via facsimile by calling (808) 522-8260.

In our final rule, we will include a concise general statement of comments received and identify any changes from the proposed rule based on the comments. If, as we expect, we will make the final rule effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**, we will explain our good cause for doing so as required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

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 Honolulu 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 separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

Terrorist attacks in New York City, New York and on the Pentagon Building in Arlington, Virginia, on September 11, 2001, have called for the implementation of additional measures to protect national security. National security and intelligence officials warn that future terrorist attacks against civilian targets may be anticipated. This proposed rule is similar to a temporary rule published October 30, 2002, creating security zones in these areas until April 19, 2003.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes designated security zones in the waters adjacent to the islands of Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI. These security zones are necessary to protect personnel, vessels, and facilities from acts of sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature during operations. In addition to creating security zones, this proposed rule would also amend an anchorage grounds regulation by adding the requirement that permission of the Captain of the Port be obtained before entering anchorage grounds in Mamala Bay.

These proposed security zones extend from the surface of the water to the ocean floor.

Entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Honolulu, HI. Representatives of the Captain of the Port Honolulu will enforce these security zones. The Captain of the Port may be assisted by other federal or state agencies. Periodically, by Broadcast Notice to Mariners, the Coast Guard will announce the existence or status of the security zones in this proposed rule.

These proposed security zones are intended to provide for the safety and security of the public, maritime commerce, and transportation, by creating security zones in designated harbors, anchorages, facilities, and adjacent navigable waters of the United States.

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 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 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 expectation is based on the fact that vessels will be able to freely transit the areas outside of any security zones. In addition, the COTP can allow vessels to transit the security zones on a case-by-case basis.

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. No small business impacts are anticipated due to the small size of the zones.

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.

Assistance for Small Entities

Because we did not anticipate any small business impacts, we did not offer assistance to small entities in understanding the rule.

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 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. 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 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.ID, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects

33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to

amend 33 CFR parts 110 and 165 as follows:

PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2030, 2035, 2071; 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 1.05–1(g).

2. In § 110.235 add a new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 110.235 Pacific Ocean (Mamala Bay), Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii (Datus: NAD 83)

* * * * *

(c) Before entering into the anchorage grounds in this section you must first obtain permission from the Captain of the Port Honolulu.

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

3. 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.

4. A new § 165.1407 is added to read as follows:

§ 165.1407 Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI

(a) *Location.* The following areas, from the surface of the water to the ocean floor, are security zones:

(1) All waters of Honolulu Harbor and entrance channel, Keehi Lagoon, and General Anchorages A, B, C, and D as defined in 33 CFR 110.235 that are shoreward of the following coordinates: The shoreline at 21°–17.68'N/157°–52.0'W; thence due south to 21°–16.0'N/157°–52.0'W, thence due west to 21°–16.0'N/157°–55.58'W, thence due north to Honolulu International Airport Reef Runway at 21°–18.25'N/157°–55.58'W.

(2) The waters around the Tesoro Single Point and the Chevron Conventional Buoy Moorings beginning at 21°–16.43'N/158°–6.03'W thence northeast to 21°–17.35'N/158°–3.95'W thence southeast to 21°–16.47'N/158°–3.5'W thence southwest to 12°–15.53'N/158°–5.56'W thence north to the beginning point.

(3) The Kahului Harbor and Entrance Channel, Maui, HI consisting of all waters shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION line. (See 33 CFR 80.1460).

(4) All waters within the Nawiliwili Harbor, Kauai, HI shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION line (See 33 CFR 80.1450).

(5) All waters of Port Allen Harbor, Kauai, HI shoreward of the COLREGS

DEMARCATION line (See 33 CFR 80.1440).

(6) The waters within a 100-yard radius centered on each cruise ship in Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, HI and Entrance Channel shoreward of the COLREGS DEMARCATION (See 33 CFR 80.1480). This is a moving security zone when the cruise ship is in transit and becomes a fixed zone when the cruise ship is anchored or moored.

(7) The waters extending out 500 yards in all directions from cruise ships anchored or position keeping within 3 miles of:

(i) Lahaina Harbor, Maui, between Makila Point and Puunoa Point.

(ii) Kailua-Kona Harbor, Hawaii, between Keahulolu Point and Puapua Point.

(8) All waters contained within the Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, enclosed by a line drawn between Harbor Entrance Channel Light 6 and the jetty point day beacon at 21°–19.5'N/158°–07.3'W.

(b) *Designated Representative:* A designated representative of the Captain of the Port is any Coast Guard commissioned officer, warrant or petty officer that has been authorized by the Captain of the Port Honolulu to act on his behalf.

(c) *Cruise ship:* For the purposes of this section, the term “cruise ship” is defined as a passenger vessel over 100 gross tons, carrying more than 12 passengers for hire, making a voyage lasting more than 24 hours, any part of which is on the high seas, and for which passengers are embarked or disembarked in the United States or its territories. A “voyage” in this section means the cruise ship’s entire course of travel, from the first port at which the cruise ship embarks passengers until its return to that port or another port where the majority of passengers are disembarked and terminate their voyage.

(d) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with § 165.33, entry into these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Honolulu or his designated representatives. Section 165.33 also contains other general requirements.

(2) The existence or status of the security zones in this section will be announced periodically by Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

(3) Persons desiring to transit the areas of the security zones may contact the Captain of the Port at command center telephone number (808) 541–2477 or on VHF channel 16 (156.8 Mhz) 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 designated representatives.

Authority: In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

Dated: January 17, 2003.

G.A. Wiltshire,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Fourteenth Coast Guard District (Acting).

[FR Doc. 03–2523 Filed 2–3–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 03–151; MB Docket No. 02–263; RM–10498, RM–10606]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Eagar and Safford, AZ

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; dismissal.

SUMMARY: This document dismisses the petition for rule making filed by Graham County FM Associates, requesting the allotment of Channel 246C3 to Safford, Arizona, as that community’s second local aural transmission service. No expression of interest was filed requesting the allotment of Channel 246C3 at Safford, Arizona. It is Commission’s policy to refrain from making a new allotment to a community absent an expression of interest. A counterproposal was filed by Eagar Broadcasting proposing the allotment of Channel 246C at Eagar, Arizona, as that community’s first local aural transmission service. On December 30, 2002, Eagar Broadcasting filed a Request for Approval of Withdrawal for its counterproposal filed in this proceeding. This document grants the Request for Approval of Withdrawal and dismisses the counterproposal filed by Eagar Broadcasting proposing the allotment of Channel 246C at Eagar, Arizona, as that community’s first local aural transmission service.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rolanda F. Smith, Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission’s Report and Order, MB Docket Nos. 02–263, adopted January 15, 2003, and released January 21, 2003. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during regular business hours at the FCC’s Reference