

elapsed between the date you acquired it and the date of damage or loss.

(c) Current replacement cost and depreciated value are determined by use of publicly available adjustment rates or through use of other reasonable methods at the discretion of the SSA Claims Officer.

(d) Replacement of lost or damaged property may be made in kind wherever appropriate at the discretion of the SSA Claims Officer.

(e) At the discretion of the SSA Claims Officer, you may be required to turn over an item alleged to have been damaged beyond economical repair to the United States, in which case no deduction for salvage value will be made in the calculation of actual value.

(f) Settlement of claims under the Act are final and conclusive.

§ 429.209 Are there any restrictions on attorney's fees?

No more than 10 per cent of the amount in settlement of each individual claim submitted and settled under this subpart shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with that claim. A person violating this subsection shall be fined not more than \$1,000.00. (31 U.S.C. 3721(i))

§ 429.210 Do I have any appeal rights under this subpart?

(a) *Deciding Official.* While you may not appeal the decision of the SSA Claims Officer in regard to claims under the MPCECA, the SSA Claims Officer may, at his or her discretion, reconsider his or her determination of a claim.

(b) *Claimant.* You may request reconsideration from the SSA Claims Officer by sending a written request for reconsideration to the SSA Claims Officer within 30 days of the date of the original determination. You must clearly state the factual or legal basis upon which you base your request for a more favorable determination. Reconsideration will be granted only for reasons not available or not considered during the original decision.

(c) *Notification.* The SSA Claims Officer will send you a written determination on your request for reconsideration. If the SSA Claims Officer elects to reconsider your claim, the final determination on reconsideration is final and conclusive.

§ 429.211 Are there any penalties for filing false claims?

A person who files a false claim or makes a false or fraudulent statement in a claim against the United States may be imprisoned for not more than 5 years (18 U.S.C. 287; 1001). In addition, that

person may be liable for a civil penalty of not less than \$5,000 and not more than \$10,000 and damages of triple the loss or damage sustained by the United States, as well as the costs of a civil action brought to recover any penalty or damages (31 U.S.C. 3729).

[FR Doc. 02-32051 Filed 12-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07-02-151]

RIN 2115-AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Biscayne Bay, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Miami River, Miami-Dade County, Florida

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the regulations governing the operation of the East and West Spans of the Venetian Causeway bridges across the Miami Beach Channel on the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, and the Brickell Avenue and Miami Avenue bridges across the Miami River, Miami-Dade County. This proposed rule would allow these bridges to remain in the closed position during the running of the Miami Tropical Marathon on February 2, 2003.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before January 21, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (obr), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE. 1st Ave, Room 432, Miami, FL 33131. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in the preamble as being available in the docket, are part of [CGD07-02-151] and are available for inspection or copying at Commander (obr), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 S.E. 1st Avenue, Room 432, Miami, FL 33131 between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 909 SE. 1st Ave Miami, FL 33131, telephone number 305-415-6743.

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 [CGD07-02-151], 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. We anticipate making this proposed rule effective less than 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** because the event is scheduled for February 2, 2003 and we want to allow enough time for the public to comment on this proposed rule.

Public Meeting

A public meeting has not been scheduled for this proposed rule. However, you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Bridge Branch, Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE 1st Ave, Room 432, Miami, FL 33131, 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

The Miami Tropical Marathon Director has requested that the Coast Guard temporarily change the existing regulations governing the operation of the East and West Spans of the Venetian Causeway bridges, and the Brickell Avenue and Miami Avenue bridges to allow them to remain in the closed position during the running of the Miami Tropical Marathon on February 2, 2003. The marathon route passes over these four bridges and any bridge opening would disrupt the race. Based on the limited time the bridges would be closed, the Coast Guard believes it can accommodate the request while still providing for the reasonable needs of navigation.

The East and West Spans of the Venetian Causeway bridges are located between Miami and Miami Beach. The current regulation governing the operation of the East Span of the Venetian Causeway bridge is published in 33 CFR 117.269 and requires the bridge to open on signal; except that, from November 1 through April 30 from 7:15 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. and from 4:45 p.m. to 6:15 p.m. Monday through Friday, the draw need not be opened.

However, the draw shall open at 7:45 a.m., 8:15 a.m., 5:15 p.m., and 5:45 p.m., if any vessels are waiting to pass. The draw shall open on signal on Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, and Washington's Birthday. Moreover, the bridge must open for public vessels of the United States, tugs with tows, regularly scheduled cruise vessels, and vessels in distress.

The regulation governing the West Span of the Venetian Causeway bridge is published in 33 CFR 117.5 and requires the bridge to open on signal.

The operating schedule of the Brickell Avenue and Miami Avenue bridges is published in 33 CFR 117.305 and requires each bridge to open on signal; except that, from 7:30 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday except Federal holidays, the draws need not be opened for the passage of vessels. Public vessels of the United States and vessels in an emergency involving danger to life or property are allowed to pass at any time.

We believe that this proposed rule would not adversely affect the reasonable needs of navigation due to the limited time the bridges would be in the closed position.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the operating regulations of the East and West Spans of the Venetian Causeway bridges, and the Brickell Avenue and Miami Avenue bridges on February 2, 2003. This proposed rule would allow the East Span of the Venetian Causeway bridge to remain closed from 6:10 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. on February 2, 2003. The proposed rule would allow the West Span of the Venetian Causeway to remain closed from 6:15 a.m. to 9:20 a.m. on February 2, 2003. The Brickell Avenue bridge would be allowed to remain closed from 7:10 a.m. to 11:59 a.m. on February 2, 2003. The Miami Avenue bridge would be allowed to remain closed from 6:30 a.m. to 10 a.m. on February 2, 2003. Public vessels of the United States and vessels in distress shall be passed at anytime.

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). 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 because preliminary data indicates that there have been limited numbers of requests for openings during these time periods and this proposed rule still provides for regular openings throughout the day.

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 because the proposed rule will only be in effect for a limited period of time and race committee officials are working with affected parties to minimize the impact of this proposed rule.

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 to the address under **ADDRESSES**. In your comment, explain why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule 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 this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If this proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. We also have a point of contact for commenting on actions by employees of the Coast Guard. 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

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 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 regulatory actions not specifically required by law. 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. Although 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 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.

Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this proposed 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. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

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.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the 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. From 6:15 a.m. until 9:20 a.m. on February 2, 2003, in § 117.261 add temporary paragraph (ss) to read as follows:

§ 117.261 Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway from St. Marys River to Key Largo.

* * * * *

(ss) *West Span of the Venetian Causeway, mile 1088.6 at Miami.* The draw need not open from 6:15 a.m. until 9:20 a.m. on February 2, 2003. Public vessels of the United States and vessels in distress shall be passed at anytime.

3. From 6:10 a.m. until 8:30 a.m. on February 2, 2003, suspend § 117.269 and add a new temporary § 117.T151 to read as follows:

§ 117.T151 Biscayne Bay.

The draw of the East Span of the Venetian Causeway bridge across Miami Beach Channel need not open from 6:10 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. on February 2, 2003. Public vessels of the United States and vessels in distress shall be passed at anytime.

4. From 6:30 a.m. until 11:59 a.m. on February 2, 2003, suspend § 117.305 and add a new temporary § 117.T159 to read as follows:

§ 117.T159 Miami River.

The draw of each bridge from the mouth to and including the N.W. 27th Avenue bridge, mile 3.7 at Miami, except the Miami Avenue and Brickell Avenue bridges, shall open on signal: except that, from 7:30 a.m. to 9 a.m. and from 4:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday except Federal holidays, the draws need not be opened for the passage of vessels. The Miami Avenue bridge, across the Miami River, need not open from 6:30 a.m. to 10 a.m. on February 2, 2003 and the Brickell Avenue bridge, across the Miami River, need not open from 7:10 a.m. to 11:59 a.m. on February 2, 2003. Public vessels of the United States and vessels in an emergency involving danger to life or property shall be passed at any time.

Dated: December 13, 2002.

James S. Carmichael,

Rear Admiral, Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02–32140 Filed 12–19–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. 2002–5]

Notice of Termination

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: Commencing January 1, 2003, copyright owners or their statutory successors will be entitled, under certain circumstances prescribed by

section 203 of the Copyright Act, to terminate transfers or licenses of copyright that were granted on or after January 1, 1978. The Copyright Office is proposing to adopt a regulation governing the form, content, and manner of service of notices of termination. The proposed regulation is based on the existing Copyright Office regulation governing termination of transfers and licenses covering the extended renewal term, and is adapted to meet the requirements for termination of post-1977 transfers and licenses.

DATES: Comments should be in writing and received on or before February 3, 2003. Reply comments should be received on or before March 5, 2003.

ADDRESSES: If sent *by mail*, 10 copies of written comments should be addressed to: David O. Carson, General Counsel, Copyright GC/I&R, P.O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, DC 20540. If *hand delivered*, 10 copies should be brought to: Office of the General Counsel, Copyright Office, James Madison Memorial Building, Room LM–403, First and Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David O. Carson, General Counsel. Telephone: (202) 707–8380. Telefax: (202) 707–8366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Prior to the effective date of the Copyright Act of 1976, the term of copyright was 28 years, subject to renewal by the author or certain other persons described in the statute for an additional 28 years. The second term was considered a new estate, meaning that with certain exceptions such as works made for hire, all rights reverted to the author at the commencement of the second term, and transfers or licenses of copyrights made during the initial 28-year term automatically terminated.¹ The 1976 Copyright Act abandoned the two-term system of copyright duration in favor of a unitary term, but it provided for two circumstances under which authors or their statutory successors could terminate transfers or licenses of rights.

First, because the 1976 Act added 19 years to the terms of existing copyrights, extending the renewal term from 28 years to 47 years, section 304(c) provides that authors or certain statutory successors (such as the surviving spouse, children and

¹ In *Fred Fisher Music Co. v. M. Witmark & Sons*, 318 U.S. 643 (1943), the Supreme Court significantly limited this rule by holding that authors could, during the initial term of copyright, assign renewal term rights and that such assignments would be valid during the renewal term if the author was alive at the commencement of the renewal term.