

minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

#### Environmental

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded 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**.

#### 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 relationships 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 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), Reports 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, 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. A new temporary § 165.T07-170 is added to read as follows:

#### § 165.T07-170 Security Zones; Port of Tampa, Tampa Florida.

(a) *Regulated area.* Temporary security zones are established 100 yards around moored cruise ships in Tampa, Florida. No vessel shall be allowed within 100 yards of the moored cruise ship without permission from the Coast Guard.

(b) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entry into these zones is prohibited except as authorized by the Captain of the Port, or a Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer designated by him. The Captain of the Port will notify the public via Marine Safety Radio Broadcast on VHF Marine Band Radio, Channels 13 and 16 (157.1 MHz) of all active security zones in port by identifying the names of the vessels around which they are centered.

(c) *Dates.* This section is effective from 6 p.m. on September 26, 2001 until 6 p.m. on June 15, 2002.

Dated: September 26, 2001.

**A.L. Thompson, Jr.,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Tampa, Florida.*

[FR Doc. 02-5465 Filed 3-7-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

#### 38 CFR Part 32

**RIN 2900-AJ86**

#### Loan Guaranty: Advertising and Solicitation Requirements; Correction

**AGENCY:** Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** In a document published in the **Federal Register** on March 1, 2002 (67 FR 9402), we amended VA's loan guaranty regulations by prohibiting advertisements or solicitations from lenders that falsely state or imply that they were issued by or at the direction of VA or any other entity of the United States Government. The document contains a typographical error in the "Approved" date section. This document corrects that typographical error.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This correction is effective March 1, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** R.D. Finneran, Assistant Director for Loan

Policy and Valuation (262), Loan guaranty Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 273-7368.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In rule FR Doc. 02-4866, published on March 1, 2002 (67 FR 9402), on page 9402, in column 3, the date "December 3, 2002" is corrected to read "December 3, 2001".

Approved: March 1, 2002.

**Thomas O. Gessel,**

*Director, Office of Regulatory Law.*

[FR Doc. 02-5661 Filed 3-7-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8320-01-M**

#### POSTAL SERVICE

#### 39 CFR Part 111

#### Domestic Mail Manual Changes for Bedloaded Bundles of Periodicals

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service is eliminating the option in the Domestic Mail Manual that allows mailers to bedload bundles (more than one package strapped together) of Periodicals flat-size mail.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 31, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Anne Emmerth at (703) 292-3641.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On December 20, 2001, the Postal Service published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 65668) soliciting comments on a proposal to delete the standards in the *Domestic Mail Manual* (DMM) that allow bundles (more than one package strapped together) of Periodicals flat-size mail to be bedloaded instead of placed in sacks or on pallets.

Current DMM M210.5.0 and M220.5.0 allow authorized mailers to place packages of Presorted rate and carrier route rate Periodicals flats directly into a truck or trailer if the packages are secured together into bundles containing a minimum of 20 pounds of mail (instead of sacking or palletizing those packages). Such preparation is optional and requires Postal Service authorization from Business Mailer Support at Headquarters.

Postal Service records indicate that there are no mailers who are preparing mail in this manner.

We received no comments opposing the proposal and one comment in support of eliminating this mail preparation option. The commenter, a large commercial printer, supports the Postal Service's efforts to streamline